

## WHAT CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION MEANT<sup>1</sup>

**I**N the course of this year of grace, 1929, British and Irish Catholics will celebrate what popularly passes for the measure which completed their restoration to civil and religious liberty. It is right that the Emancipation Act of April 13, 1829, should be regarded at least as a landmark, dividing one era from another: but it is also right that its real meaning and force should be properly understood. This we are assisted to do by the perusal of the two able books mentioned below which present in convenient compass the substance of longer and more detailed investigations, and which may be considered as complementary, one to the other. Mr. Gwynn is the more objective, aiming at arranging in due order and proportion the various contending personalities and projects from which, by process of what he aptly calls a "struggle," the result was achieved. Father O'Herlihy goes more deeply below the surface and examines more critically the struggle, its antecedents, and its result. The reader of both books will probably arrive at a more accurate conclusion than the reader of only one, but if, as most educated Catholics do, he already knows in general the surface course of events, he will probably be the more intrigued, interested and enlightened by the smaller work, as it presents a point of view less familiar on this side of the Irish Sea, that, viz., of "Irish Ireland." What more we have to say about them, beyond recommending them most heartily to our readers, will appear incidentally in the course of these reflections.

The reluctance with which that crowned reprobate, George IV. signed the Emancipation Bill, a reluctance so violent and unreasonable as to suggest a share in his father's malady, or an appalling ignorance of the Bill's meaning and effects, was after all but the concentrated expression of what had long been the prevailing disposition in the nation at large. It was illiberal and intolerant in the extreme, the

<sup>1</sup> *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*, by Denis Gwynn (Longmans : 10s. 6d. net). *Catholic Emancipation Reviewed*, by Timothy O'Herlihy, C.M. (Gill : 3s. 6d. net).

growth of three centuries of malignant misrepresentation of Catholicism, and was destined for many years to come to deprive Catholics of complete equality in the eyes of the Law. And as for the Act itself, the more one examines it, the less its intrinsic importance appears to be. The emancipation which mattered, the abolition of the religious portions of the Penal Code, had been won by the Relief Acts of 1778, 1791 and 1793: comparatively speaking, what was gained in 1829 was of little practical account: it bettered the actual position of only a few Catholics in England and, as we shall see, resulted in putting the majority of Irish Catholics politically in a worse condition. Moreover, the motive for passing the Act was not a sense of injustice to be remedied, not a desire to make amends for oppression, not any feeling of shame or sorrow for generations of persecution, but openly and avowedly the motive of fear. Wellington admitted that nothing but the dread of civil war and the disruption of the Empire, led him to further the Catholic claims for justice. We do not deny that many enlightened statesmen had made the Catholic cause theirs. Burke, Fox, Canning, Cobbett and others were conscious of past injustice, and were anxious to undo it, whilst thinkers like Sydney Smith and Dr. Johnson did much to break down prejudice, but the actual authors of Emancipation only did right because they were compelled to. And having resolved to do it, they proceeded to mar their work by the conditions with which they accompanied this tardy and insufficient act of justice. Father O'Herlihy quotes from Froude an outspoken recognition of this habitual *bêtise* of English governmental action towards Ireland:

The English people do not see that to remove even just grounds for complaint is made useless by the form in which the concession is made. They never legislate beforehand with a desire to be just: they wait for rebellion or danger of it, and then they yield without dignity and without deliberation. What they give is accepted without gratitude . . . from the date of the conquest we have neglected every duty which a ruling power owes to its subjects.

In this case the abolition of the anti-Catholic Oath of Allegiance and Declaration against Transubstantiation was accompanied by the imposition of a new Oath, only barely

tolerable from the point of view of Catholic doctrine, as explained elsewhere in this issue, and full of offensive reflections on the Supreme Pontiff. It bound all Catholic voters and Members of Parliament and all Catholics holding office of any kind under the Crown to maintain "the existing settlement of property within the realm," and, worse still, not to do anything to "subvert the present Church establishment." It contained the usual insulting disclaimer of equivocation. And there were in the Act a number of vexatious restrictions in the Protestant interest, meant to stigmatize the Catholic religion and to hamper its growth. Catholic priests were still prohibited legally from assisting at the marriages of the faithful. Catholic soldiers and sailors were still compelled to attend Protestant worship. Catholic charities, spiritual and temporal, could not profit legally by bequests, being regarded as "superstitious usages." Bishop Ward, as Mr. Gwynn reminds us, calls the measure "a layman's Act," but, beyond throwing open the Defence and Civil services to the few who were in a position to enter them; beyond admitting what was, and must always be, a small number to Parliament, and admitting to a very restricted franchise a certain proportion of the more well-to-do, it left the bulk of the Catholic body practically as it was. Psychologically, however, the Act, as we have said, did mark an epoch. In a democracy, the franchise, active and passive, is the chief sign of citizenship: thus, Catholics were no longer outside, or only partially in, the State. Careers of honour and emolument were now possible to an increasing number, and more efficient means of working for the removal of other disabilities were won. Yet long and weary was to be the struggle for equal citizenship. Full toleration for the Church, full recognition of the rights of conscience, had yet to be gained. Even now the profession of Catholicism debars many of our children from their just share in State-provided education. Not long ago an Anglican prelate, meaning to be kind and courteous, spoke of Catholics in England as "guests of the nation," thus unconsciously denying them the citizenship which was theirs as truly as his. But, in England at any rate, 1829 removed the stigma of outlawry, and proclaimed the final failure of persecution. It was a real and necessary step towards the freedom we enjoy to-day.

In Ireland, on the other hand, the immediate good results were very much less, whilst on the whole the effect was

gravely detrimental to the political status of the majority. The condition of Catholics was not exactly the same in the two countries, as Mr. Gwynn is at pains to establish. We must glance at the history of the period preceding Emancipation in order to make this and other matters clear. In Ireland, political issues were much more deeply involved with religious, owing to Pitt's promise to grant Emancipation if his project of Union were not opposed. It must be remembered, and Father O'Herlihy takes care that we don't forget it, that even before the Reformation, English policy in Ireland had divided the country religiously as well as politically into two opposed camps. The original English invaders had shown such a tendency to assimilate the Irish dress, customs and laws, as well as the Irish point of view, that the Statute of Kilkenny (1367), in the reign of Edward III. was passed by a Parliament of the Pale to make such intercourse treasonable. This official, and artificial, partition affected the Church as well, and Anglo-Norman prelates sometimes showed as little concern for the Irish outside the Pale as Anglo-Norman barons. The Henrician revolt from the Papacy resulted, in Ireland as in England, in the defection of most of the Hierarchy, and the plunder of religious houses. But there was no apparatus for the systematic enforcement of the schism, and even after Anglicanism was inaugurated under Elizabeth and a Dublin Parliament passed Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, imposing the Protestant Prayer Book, only a few Bishops within reach of the English law conformed. As English rule extended, the Catholic prelates were driven from their dioceses and replaced by Protestants, but the last to be thus expelled, the Bishop of Kilmore, managed to hold his See till 1585. The Catholic succession however, was not broken, and all through penal times, Bishop succeeded Bishop in nearly all the Catholic dioceses and maintained the faith in spite of poverty and persecution.

The result of the Reformation was thus to add an alien religion to the already existing causes of division and to accentuate the difference between the governing class, now identified with anti-Catholicism, and the vast majority of the population who were practically outlawed in their own land. The expedition of Cromwell was in effect a crusade against the Catholic religion, and though some toleration of worship was shown in the reign of Charles II., the fortunes of the faith followed the downfall of his brother.

The Treaty of Limerick in 1691 promised religious freedom to the Catholics and possession of their estates to the Irish adherents of James, but that solemn agreement was immediately violated and an Irish Protestant Parliament proceeded to enact that code of legalized barbarity and intolerance, characterized once for all in the immortal words of Burke as "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression and impoverishment of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." Its nature, object and effects are admirably summarized in Mr. Gwynn's first chapter. Its openly-avowed purpose was the extirpation of the Catholic religion by reducing Catholics to beggary; everything was done to make the faith intolerable in the material order and to put a premium on apostasy, and for eighty years this policy was relentlessly pursued by those in power. But the very violence of that iniquitous code prevented its entire application. Decent-minded Protestants came to the aid of their Catholic friends and neighbours, and enabled them to preserve their lands. Still against the covetous and ill-conditioned they had no redress: they were denied the franchise, and had, of course, no representatives in Parliament.

As lately as 1760 an Irish Protestant Lord Chancellor announced as an established legal axiom "that the law did not presume a Papist to exist in the kingdom: nor could they so much as breathe there without the connivance of the Government." That bigoted Government, which, from Poyning's Law (1494) onwards, successive Acts of the English Parliament had stripped more and more of real power, could still, and did, reflect the anti-Catholicism of its masters. It has been termed the most corrupt political assembly that ever existed. Father O'Herlihy reminds us that out of its 300 members only 70 were returned by a free vote. Its executive was independent of the members and entirely responsible to English ministers. It functioned simply as a committee of the London Parliament, and its main *raison d'être* was to uphold by every means Protestant Ascendancy. Taking advantage of the troubles of the time—revolution in France and in America—Grattan secured the independence of this body in 1782, but even then, even after Catholics, by compelling the Relief Act of 1778, had vindicated their rights to freedom of conscience, it refused them

the political franchise, and it was not until 1793, when Pitt needed Catholics for the Army, that it was forced to allow them the right to vote and other similar marks of citizenship. The franchise was a surprisingly low one, reaching down to 40s. freeholders, but there recognition of civic rights stopped. The English Parliament refused to insist on the right of Catholics to be elected and the Irish tried to nullify the effects of the former concession as much as possible. It is certain that Pitt meant, by fostering the intransigence of the Dublin body, to convince Irish Catholics that they could not win full civic rights from their own countrymen and to prepare them to negotiate with England instead. So much is admitted by Castlereagh in a letter quoted by Mr. Gwynn. "The true policy is [he wrote] by a steady resistance of their claims so long as the countries remain separate, to make them feel that they can be carried only with us through a Union." The policy succeeded. With the conviction that Pitt meant to destroy that Protestant ascendancy under which their people had groaned for generations, many of the Irish Catholic Bishops helped him to destroy the Irish Parliament. That bigoted body was finally bribed into voting its own abolition but, before dying, managed to block the measure of justice which Pitt had promised the Catholics.

Our two authors agree in describing the Catholic decision in this matter as shortsighted and unfortunate. The longer and better view would have been to have used what political power had already been won from the Ascendancy to acquire more and to trust to the preponderating numbers and growing wealth of the Catholics to secure justice from the domestic legislature. But the majority of Catholics had nothing but contempt for a Parliament which was in no true sense national, and whose one object was to keep them in subjection. They could have prevented the Union if they had joined with the Protestant opposition: they would have prevented it, if the Irish Parliament had not preferred the gratification of its anti-Catholicism to its own true interests. As long as the persecuted Irish Catholics could make or mar Pitt's projects, they had a powerful weapon wherewith to press their demands. But the Union once effected, and Pitt shown to be unable or unwilling to fulfil his bargain, they became comparatively impotent. Their power to influence the Union Parliament, to which no Catholics were admitted, and of which the Upper House was solidly opposed

to their claims, against the embattled bigotry of the Establishment and in face of the obstinacy of a lunatic King, had become much less even than their influence over their own local assembly, and for the time, the chief activities of the Emancipation movement were transferred to England.

There the lead was taken by the few English Catholics of social prominence, acting on their own initiative and often against the counsels of their ecclesiastical superiors. The tangled history of a generation of efforts, complicated by misunderstandings and quarrels between the different Catholic parties, both in England and Ireland, is ably set forth by both our authorities. Father O'Herlihy points out that although the Protestants of Ireland had lost their Parliament, the Catholics had still their own—a perambulatory, intermittent body of many names which began life as the "Catholic Committee" in 1759, appeared as the "Catholic Board" in 1811, then in 1823 as the "Catholic Association" and when that was suppressed in 1825, took life again under the irreproachable title of the "New Catholic Association for all purposes allowable by Law." Under O'Connell's leadership this organization, which although it could not turn the Catholic claims into law could formulate and urge them with enormous force, became the final means of forcing Wellington's Government to capitulate. But meanwhile the whole period of 28 years from the Union was filled with other endeavours to break down Protestant opposition by concessions and compromises nearly affecting the Catholic faith. The chief promoters of these dangerous and ineffective devices, which would have involved Government control over the appointment of Catholic bishops and the subsidizing (and enslaving) of the Catholic clergy, were the members of what was called the Cisalpine Club which was formed in England in 1792. It represented the class which had most to gain by admission to citizenship, who in proportion as their worth was acknowledged socially, felt very keenly their inability to join with their equals in one form or another of the public service. And their consciousness of the complete compatibility between the tenets of their faith and loyalty to their country made them chafe the more restlessly under the imputation of disloyalty and urged them to go to great lengths to disprove it. Hence a natural tendency to minimize the obligations of the Catholic faith in deference to unreasoning Protestant prejudice, which, on its own principles of freedom of judg-

ment, had no right to consider Protestantism as the only religion for the English citizen. The mistake of the Cisalpines was to pander to this prejudice instead of boldly attacking and exposing it, and it led to a generation of internecine strife between clergy and laity, and a series of fruitless efforts to placate a bigoted Parliament and King by humiliating protestations that the faith for which their forefathers suffered and died was not so dangerous to civil society as it seemed to be. They were willing to give "securities," instead of scorning the imputation that securities were necessary. They were ready to allow a measure of interference by the civil government with the government of the Church, which, barely tolerable under the feudal system or when a State is practically Catholic, would have spelt slavery and degradation, if allowed to a Government which but lately had been legislating Catholicism to death and which would have had no scruple in trying to control the Catholic Church in England and Ireland as effectively as it did its own Establishment. The foundation and partial endowment of Maynooth in 1795, although in itself an act of bare justice to the despoiled Irish Church, was a step in this direction. The concession of a Veto on the appointment of Bishops and the higher clergy, together with the provision of clerical stipends, in return for political Emancipation was so obviously framed to destroy the liberty of the Church, that it is strange that even ecclesiastics were found to favour it. O'Connell in Ireland and Bishop Milner in this country awakened Catholics to the dangers which lurked in the proposals, which indeed the Irish Hierarchy had solemnly repudiated in 1808. But O'Connell's statement that the Veto "was an attempt to acquire without expense an influence greater than any minister could purchase for millions," and his demand for unconditional emancipation, expressed the mind of his countrymen in general, although even in Ireland there was a small band, Cisalpine in tone and spirit. In England in 1813, Milner's influence was able to defeat an Emancipation Bill, conceding the Veto, favoured by the Cisalpines and proposed by the great Henry Grattan himself. Naturally enough after this the English Parliament left Catholic grievances severely alone for a time, until again they were forced upon its attention by the agitation, in Ireland maintained by the genius of O'Connell.

But when this finally prevailed, it was at a cost, as we have

said, fatal to the political welfare of the majority of Irish Catholics. The franchise which elected O'Connell for Clare, in spite of all the efforts of the Protestant and landed interest to defeat him, was the wide franchise won from the Irish Parliament in 1793. It was the Irish peasantry, the 40s. freeholders, that secured his triumph. Hitherto they had been afraid to use their votes against their landlords, voting being public, and eviction sure to follow any sign of independence. But in 1823 they had been inspired by O'Connell to use their power, and to break that of the Protestant Ascendancy by electing members favourable to Catholics. However, as if to punish this independence, the Emancipation Act contained a clause greatly restricting the Irish franchise. "The vast majority of the common people in Ireland," writes Father O'Herlihy, "were rendered innocuous politically by the great measure which was the Magna Charta of their freedom." And the same writer points out that the admission of the Irish leaders into the British Parliament more effectually impaired the cause of Irish nationalism than if the penal laws had been left in force. The centre of political importance was shifted to another land, and Ireland became a decaying province, the prey to countless social abuses which she was powerless to remedy. What wonder that to-day educated Irish opinion is disposed to look askance at 1829, and to consider that the boundless energy and fervid eloquence of O'Connell were to some extent misapplied. Political emancipation, seen in proper perspective, appears a small thing compared with the reform of the iniquitous land system, and the disestablishment of a grasping, proselytizing Church for which the country had to wait for many weary years. The Irish peasant remained a serf for three generations after Emancipation, the Irish Catholic was denied both elementary and higher education, as far as the influence prevailed of an alien Church and an indifferent legislature, till modern times. The measure did nothing to promote Irish industry and make the country capable of supporting its inhabitants. Thus, the freedom then conferred was only the beginning: real emancipation, in so far as it has been achieved, has been the work of the intervening century.

And the same is true, to some extent, of this country. How very gradually did Catholics here emerge from the Catacombs! Newman in his "Second Spring" describes the persecuted members of the faith as a sort of *gens lucifuga*,

and the habit of self-effacement continued long after the excuse for it. They numbered about 70,000 (in England and Wales) in the year 1780, when the whole population was about seven millions, and were probably not much over 100,000 in 1829 out of a total of thirteen millions. So they were reckoned of little account by the multitudes with whom they mingled, and their many real grievances, summarized above, were only gradually redressed. We have much to be thankful for when we look back on this century of struggle, but whilst we compare with gratitude the social and political liberty which we have won, with the oppression and contempt which the profession of the faith caused our predecessors, we may profitably ask,—Are we Catholics, in a mainly Protestant atmosphere, even yet completely emancipated? Rome conquered Greece but the Greek mind, for good and evil, conquered the Roman. It is possible to be externally free yet interiorly in bondage. In Ireland there is a growing realization that a country is not free which is dominated by the literary ideals and tastes of another country of a different faith and standard of morality. This is true of the individual as well. If a Catholic is not a Catholic all through, if he takes his moral and cultural estimates from the non-Catholic world, if his interests lie mainly outside his faith, then he is not really emancipated. He is trying to serve God and Mammon: he has lost sight of the Truth that makes him free. This thought may give matter for fuller reflection by Catholics in the course of this Centenary Year of Catholic Emancipation.

JOSEPH KEATING.

## BARON FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL'S SPIRITUAL OUTLOOK

**I**T cannot but be a matter of satisfaction that in recent years English Catholic laymen have had in their ranks three at least of the most original minds of our time. In poetry Francis Thompson stands alone; in history, no one, we think, equals in range and discernment Lord Acton; in the field of the philosophy of religion Baron Friedrich von Hügel has been given a place apart, by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. We might mention others who have done us honour, in music, in biography and literature; but these three form together a special inner circle, having in common that touch of real greatness which makes them seem to belong to mankind as a whole more than to any "denomination." They are a living refutation, if any refutation may be deemed worth while, of that childish and fatuous screech of certain empty-headed critics that thought and learning and independent judgment are not to be found in the Church Catholic. In all the "denominations" put together, and with free-thinkers to help them, there are not to be found the equals of these three; and that is not a Catholic judgment only, except insofar as all men are in their hearts more Catholic than they know.

Of course, as with all men of their kind, each of these three has had to endure the consequences of his greatness. When a lesser mind, above all a mind drilled to a single perspective, comes in contact with a greater mind, above all a mind that has been trained in no school, it is inevitable that the former should look at the latter with fear and suspicion. It is the lot of greatness to be criticized, to be proved to be wrong; often it is also the lot of greatness to know that it is right and yet be unable to defend itself. Galileo's "*E puor si muove*" may be a mythical legend, a *ben trovato* and no more; nevertheless it expresses a truth which has appealed to all who realize what the larger understanding must always endure at the hands of smaller minds. It has always been so, and must always be; we express our assent to it when we speak of men being too great for, or in advance of, their generation.

Still it is no less characteristic of real greatness that in

spite of such pin-pricks, and petty persecution, and misrepresentation, it holds its ground and comes out in the end triumphant. So it has been in each of these three cases. Francis Thompson need not be considered here, he was fortunate enough to be first made known by an ode which was at once intensely Catholic and at the same time caught the heart of every thinking man. Lord Acton's case was very different. All his life he laboured under the bias pressing on him of his master, the overwhelmingly learned Döllinger. While amassing knowledge himself second to none in his generation, he had at the same time to preserve his own balance; and we cannot wonder if at times he had ideas which seemed inconsistent. Nevertheless this seems to be true; his statements, however startling, have seldom if ever been proved to be wrong; and however critical he might seem to have been, he lived and died a consistent and never-doubting Catholic. If his historical range was so great as to tolerate evil where others would not see it, his faith was greater still and transcended every human flaw whatever.

The case of Baron von Hügel has been still more striking. In the days of the modernist menace there were some who would have said that he was at the root of all the trouble; there were modernist leaders themselves who would freely have said this, but that something they could not define held them back. That something was the Baron's own personality; it was felt that in dealing with him one was dealing with a man whose convictions rested on other grounds; and that though he could not always prove his point, yet his certainty was greater than that of most men. Though a friend, and possibly a sympathizer, with modernists, he was far too great-minded to be a modernist himself. Like Acton, he might at times appear to have said and written things which the ordinary mind cannot fathom, but never was there question of faith, or loyalty to the Church, or steady pursuit of the highest spiritual ideal that he knew. And both friends and critics recognized it. Before he had spoken his soul in his "Mystical Element of Religion," men were conscious that to include him with other modernists was somehow incongruous and unjust. He was different; he was far too great. Like Acton's his mind was too utterly Catholic and universal to be beaten by a problem he could not solve, or to hurry to a solution which only betrays the impatience of a smaller vision.

To attempt to analyse the spiritual outlook of the Baron must always be difficult. For, first of all, as with most philo-

sophers who are in sympathy with Plato, he thinks, as it were, on two planes ; while he has his eye on the facts of human life, and gives them their full value, he abstracts from them and tends to speak in universals. The chief difficulty of his greatest work, "The Mystical Element of Religion," is precisely this, as the sub-title warns us : while nominally he is writing a study of "St. Catherine of Genoa and her friends," in reality he is using her and her experiences as the basis of a whole philosophy of mysticism. Given the first-hand material, such as he had in the writings of St. Catherine, any other mystic might have served his purpose equally well ; he would have deduced the same universal principles and would have used his experiences to illustrate them.

The second serious difficulty in studying the Baron is his language. Often this is supposed to be due to the German stamp of his mind and way of thinking, and to the consequent German character of his English sentences ; involved, ponderous, with compound words, and the like. But we think it is due not only to this ; the Baron when he writes of simple things can also write quite simply. It is rather due to his subject-matter, which will not allow of easy expression, in English or any other language. It is the same with him as with St. Theresa and other writers on mystical experience at first hand. They speak of that which they know to be true, but for the expression of which no medium has yet been invented. They are compelled, even as they write, to tell themselves, and sometimes to tell their readers, that what they say is not at all what they mean but that they can do no more.

Another difficulty with the Baron, as with others of his kind, is the method of his philosophy. He does not argue, he sees ; and having no other means of communicating what he knows, he aims at doing so by sheer emphasis. This is not only manifest in his writing ; those who conversed with him, as Mr. Bernard Holland bears witness in his memoir, were often convinced that what he said must be true, even though they could not follow him, because of the deep certainty with which he spoke. With minds of this kind, so long as we can follow them ourselves all is well ; but when they make a leap beyond our powers, when they seem to us to leap into the clouds, it is not a matter for surprise that we find them hard to understand. This is again the difficulty with all the mystic writers, St. Theresa perhaps most of all ; it is probably the chief difficulty with the writings of Baron von Hügel. Nor does the modern attempt psychologically to analyse the mystics, in any way

remove the difficulty ; the most it can do is to justify them when they claim to see what is not seen by ordinary men.

Akin as the Baron is thus seen to be to the mystics in his whole philosophy and outlook, still one would hesitate to class him as one of their number. He still remains a philosopher, searching for the greater truth that lies behind particular experiences ; with this only in addition to the ordinary philosopher, that he thought in prayer, guided by the light of a wonderfully child-like faith, with the result that he saw beyond the horizon of reason. This in fact is what he seems to us to mean by mysticism. It is not quite the same as that of the accepted mystical theologians or psychologists ; it begins from a different source, and ends at a different terminus. The Baron is akin to the mystics, but he is much more akin to the mind which Newman analyses in his *Grammar of Assent*.

Perhaps nothing will illustrate this more than his concept of God ; moreover this concept is fundamental to his whole spiritual perspective. We may put it this way. Beginning with man, or with a saint as representative of man at his best, he follows the saint in prayer in his search after the Godhead. He grows in his understanding till God includes, *eminenter* as the theologians say, everything that man understands by the word "good." "He grows still more, till he realizes that God must essentially be beyond even this ; that God is not only "good," but is goodness itself ; that on this account He can no longer be reckoned in the ordinary category of being ; that the very order of His being is therefore different from ours ; that the word "is," as applied to God, means something transcendently more than the same word as applied to man. Thus he says in one of his addresses :

"God is other, because this His distinct Reality is, by its nature, so much higher and richer, not only in degree but in kind, than is the nature of man or of any other creature. 'Man is made in the image and likeness of God.' Yes, but we must not press this as an exhaustive norm, as though God were simply man writ large—man's better and best instincts and conditions on an immense scale. We shall be doubtless much nearer the facts if we think of God as the Living Source and the always previous, always preventient Realization, in degrees and ways to us ineffable, of our ideals and ever imperfect achievements—a Realization which must not be taken directly to contain concretely what our conditions and strivings contain ideally. I am deeply convinced that the truth, and hence the fascination of Religion, as really requires some such em-

phasis on the *unlikeness* of God as it requires emphasis on the likeness."

The scholastic theologian or philosopher will recognize in this only another way of putting his own doctrine, taken from Aristotle, of the *ens a se* as distinct from the *ens ab alio*. But it has been reached by another path than that of Aristotle, and is made by the Baron to have a most practical bearing on the whole outlook on life, temporal and spiritual. Indeed, it is to the loss of this perspective, clear enough in the days of St. Thomas, that he attributes the rise of Protestantism later, and ascribes its continuance to-day. Protestantism, to him, is not so much the rejection of this dogma or that; it is not a question of accepting or not the supremacy of the Apostolic See. The flaw to him lies deeper down. It lies in the fact that at a time when theology was less careful, humanism came in, and with all its other blessings nevertheless humanized the Christian concept of God till the *otherness*, the essential difference of being, vanished. God was made a superman, or let us say a supernaturalized man; in this sense that what men thought of God they thought of in terms of themselves. The supernatural, in consequence, was simply "above the natural," it was not "other than natural," as Christian theology had hitherto believed and taught.

It is not difficult to see why the Baron looks upon this principle as fundamental to all religion; he would almost at times seem to make it the test of Christianity itself in its attitude to God as distinct from that of paganism. For given only the limited concept of God that man can evolve from his concept of himself, it follows of necessity that all his other concepts, natural and supernatural, will and must begin from the same source; morality, dogma, the end of life, will be looked on at first in the light of man himself, and laws and doctrines and standards of living will be formed essentially on man's own experience. But given the other, the absoluteness of God, and the utter dependence of man, then the whole perspective is reversed. Morality is no longer what man makes it to be, but what God ordains; dogma is no longer what man understands or apprehends, but what God teaches; the standard of life is no longer the best that man can make of it, but the perfect fulfilment of the will of Him who made it.

It will surely be admitted that the Baron has here reached a fundamental point at the root of all modern religious controversy, and even religious thought. Men differ in their normal judgments, in their estimates of dogma, in their out-

look on life simply because they look at these things from different, almost opposite angles ; and he endeavours to show that this difference has come through the Protestant acceptance of humanistic views in religion. What are the consequences in regard to our understanding of, and our relations with, God Himself, it would take us too long to consider here ; but when he dwells on adoration and personal humility as the basis of all right prayer, and on love, not so much as an affection but as a duty, because "He hath first loved us," and on the seeking after God as our necessary goal, once we have realized what He is, we see at once where this elementary principle may lead us, to the verge if not into the region of true mysticism.

We can well imagine one of the Baron's many non-Catholic friends, on hearing this his explicit analysis of Protestantism, protesting yet further and saying that he does not agree. He will say that to him at least religion does not begin from man but from God ; that he begins from Him, and sees all life in that perspective. To which the Baron would, with his usual sympathy for the other side reply that he quite understood ; that he distinguished between Protestantism and the individual Protestant, just as Christ Our Lord distinguished between sin and the sinner. And he would go further and say that insofar as he thought thus, and ordered his life and religion accordingly, his friend was not a Protestant ; he was one with the rest of Christianity, he was a Catholic. In one place he speaks of Protestantism itself gradually in our time shaking itself free ; little by little it is working back to the period which he calls the Golden Middle Ages.

But he would ask his friend to test his statement by two considerations. In the first place he would ask him to stand for a moment outside himself, and to look at Protestantism as a whole, and as a thing apart. As a matter of fact, without looking at himself, what is the evidence of Protestantism, both in its teaching and in its results, wherever it is seen ? What is its primary doctrine, that of the right of private judgment, but a deliberate acceptance of the principle that a man's religion begins with himself and not with God ? What is the practically universal standard of its morality, but that sin is chiefly an offence against man, and that virtue mainly consists in doing good to one's neighbour ? That these relate in the first place to God, and that the service of man is good because it is the service of God, is not the ordinary Protestant point of view, at all events in practice. In what light does Protestantism consider Revelation, and indeed all Christian doctrine ?

If God has spoken, if they come from God, they are accepted or not according as man interprets them and no more.

Then we think the Baron would go further. He would ask his Protestant friend to examine his own thoughts. He says his religion begins with God, and that his life is lived with that orientation, but as a matter of fact, is it? His principles of right and wrong, his moral standard, however noble and pure they may be in practice, are they founded on the word of God, or on his interpretation of the natural law? His beliefs, and his understanding of them, are they the word of God, or are they the substitution of his own words in their place? His concept of religion itself, is it a whole-hearted submission to God, and adoration of God, or is it not rather, first of all, a securing that all should be well with him here, and then that God should have the rest. If he can answer yes, —to the first alternatives, then the Baron would welcome him as, fundamentally at least, of the same faith with himself; the rest can be little more than a question of mutual understanding. But he would suspect that, in many cases, his protesting friend would find himself still very Protestant.

This seems to us to be the first and fundamental principle on which the Baron's whole spiritual outlook is formed. When reduced to its least denomination it may appear very elementary; nevertheless as we have endeavoured to show, following the Baron's lead, it is the one main link which unites Christianity, that is, makes it Catholic, and which separates Protestantism from the rest. Protestantism is, to him, first a corruption and then a revolt; in its revolt it has rejected God for man; whatever it believes, or teaches, or practises, it has lost the essential mystical element of all true religious faith. Individuals may possess it, but that is not due to their Protestantism; it is due to their common Christianity, which has either survived the upheaval, or has been, in these latter days, recovered from elsewhere. In this last the Baron rejoices, seeing in it more hope for reunion than in anything else; in it, too, finding fuel to feed his comprehensive charity.

We come now to the second characteristic feature of the Baron's outlook; it is only a corollary from the first. Everyone who knew him knew him to be a man of prayer; in the simplicity of his greatness he openly acknowledged it. Besides the fact of his regular attendance at daily Mass, and his frequentation of the Sacraments with the unconscious humility of a child, we have his own confession of systematic meditation for over fifty years, twenty-five years of which were spent in

prayer of thought, founded upon points, thirty in prayer of affection. Such a record puts him beyond all suspicion of sentiment or unreality ; these things, unsustained from outside, do not live so long in any soul. We have further the evidence of his humble submission to a director ; whatever his experiences, and whatever his conclusions, he would always have them checked and approved by another as being consistent with the mind of the Church.

Knowing this it comes to us with no surprise that the Baron looked on life, the life of every man, and not merely of the religious, as primarily, and indeed, entirely, a life of prayer. If God is, as He has said, the beginning and the end, if the standard of our judgments, our beliefs, our moral practice, must start from Him and go back to Him, then it follows that man's first duty, whatever else his occupation, is to keep in touch with that norm, and to arrange his life accordingly. This, he maintains, need not and should not interfere with one's ordinary affairs ; it does but secure, first, that the right perspective is preserved ; and second, that the man is not too enslaved by preoccupation with smaller things about him. We have his mind beautifully and affectionately expressed in a single sentence :

"Indeed, a genial, quiet death to self lies in every minute, when the minute is thus taken separately as the dear will and the direct vehicle of God."

In this way he arrives at the same conclusion as St. Paul, that we should "pray always" ; and in this he is at one with other spiritual writers. But after that his originality again asserts itself, and we find him very distinctly and emphatically taking sides. We have seen how he has insisted on the *otherness* of God as essential to the true Christian mind, and how the neglect of this distinction, the judging of God according to human standards, the making of Him but a superman, has been and is at the root of all our disunion. In the same way he now insists on a real distinction between the natural and the supernatural life. They are two things quite distinct ; the one is not merely an elevation of the other ; man, made of body and soul, is made to live two lives, each on a different plane, however much those planes may intersect. And if driven to define these planes he would seem to say : the natural begins with man, and ends with man, the supernatural begins with God and ends with God.

Again, when reduced to its essential elements, the Baron's principle seems obvious enough ; but that is usually the case

with all great truths. Where he creates his impression is in the way he insists upon it as a guide in practical life. Having made the distinction, he will not allow the one to absorb the other. Natural man, however supernaturally he may live, will still remain natural man, compelled to eat and sleep, to work and recreate himself, to take part in the society of men and to be interested in their lot, in other words, "to love his neighbour as himself." There may be exceptional vocations, but let them be known as exceptional. The Baron recognizes them and reveres them, but he has more in his mind the normal man, as he would consider himself to be.

"*Homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto.*"

Still, once he has insisted on the difference, then he makes it plain that the one or the other must be and will be the master; either the supernatural will be made to adapt itself to the natural or it will dominate the natural and lift it above itself. The Baron does not stop to ask which of these alternatives should be chosen; he insists that at all costs the supernatural shall be expressly cultivated for this end. Thus he writes, in his characteristic style:

"The Incarnational side of religion may never be despised nor forgotten, but must always be assigned some definite place and power within our spiritual lives. The approach to God and the condescension of God, the Invisible, Pure Spirit, on occasion of, in, and with the Sensible and Visible—the Historical, Traditional, Social, Sacramental—must remain and be cultivated within our souls."

In saying this the Baron has made another step forward. He has before insisted on the duty of praying always, flowing naturally from the true concept of God; now he insists on the necessity of formal prayer, of special times for prayer, of prayer as an element in our natural lives, if we are to secure and preserve the supremacy of the supernatural in ourselves. He allows that in this sense no man can pray always; he goes further and declares that he should not, that he ought not even to desire it. He believes that the effort to do so would not improve prayer but would spoil it; that, normally ordered, the natural life, and natural instincts, do not interfere with the supernatural but, by giving it relief, add to its constancy and vigour. Hence very plainly, in natural life, and that without exception, he recommends a natural interest in natural things as well as, and in relief of, the continued supernatural vision. Mystically minded as he is, and with his vision continually looking through details

to universals, and thence to God, still he has no use for the pure mystic. Such a being is unreal, inhuman, cannot be consistently with truth, as it is revealed to man. Thus he writes :

"The fact is that pure Mysticism is but Pantheism; and that Pantheism is, on principle and incurably, a non-moral, a supra-moral, and a non-personalist position, within which there is really no place for a distinct and definite God, for sin, for Contrition, for the sense of our being creatures, and for Adoration."

In the former case, when the Baron contrasts the Catholic and what he calls the Protestant orientation towards God, we have imagined a Protestant friend protesting. So in the present, when he sharply separates the natural from the supernatural, giving the former its full value, we can well imagine a Catholic friend asserting that this is not in accordance with the accepted teaching of the Church. Ascetic writers, he may say, are unanimous in proclaiming war against what is merely natural. They tell us that we must go against our merely natural inclinations; natural love must be converted into supernatural, and so on. St. Paul himself bids us put off the old man and put on the new. The author of the *Imitation* sums up the whole of his doctrine on this point in the single sentence : "Thou wilt make progress just so far as thou hast done violence to thyself" : *Tantum proficies quantum tibi ipsi vim intuleris.*

We do not propose to defend the Baron's position; it is possible that in his assertion of the natural element in religion, alongside of the supernatural or mystical, subordinate but none the less real and apart, he has said that which is not usually maintained in ascetical theology. None the less we can well see what would be his answer. He would call attention, first, to his explanation of freedom. Freedom is not the power to do anything one pleases; it is rather the strength to do always right, however one may be tempted. Such was the freedom of Our Lord, who was so strong that He could not do wrong; such is the freedom of the saints, free with the freedom with which Christ has made them free. In other words, the power to do wrong is not natural, as he understands nature; it is a perversion of the natural, a tendency to slavery. Nature is God-made, and therefore entirely good; to perfect what is good, in whatever order, can never go against God. When then he speaks of the natural, as contrasted with the supernatural, he has first of all eliminated

that very thing of which ascetics speak when they use the same word. Whether or not, given this elimination, they would still say that he claims for the natural too much, we may leave an open question.

It will be seen from this, and other evidences given, that the Baron does not always use his terms in quite the same sense as other religious writers. His concept of mysticism itself is not the same; in the Baron's view all religion is mystical, and every religious-minded man is to that extent a mystic. So again when he speaks of prayer, he is fond of the term, "prayer of quiet"; but this to him means something very different from the same phrase as used, let us say by Bossuet, or Olier, or Saint Theresa. Mystic-minded as he is, and much as he treats of mysticism, we do not remember that he treats anywhere explicitly of those higher forms of prayer which are usually discussed and examined by mystical theologians.

But such was never the Baron's aim. He was too much in his age and of it to lose himself in the abstract. He elaborated no theory, the consequence of argument and learning; he wrote only from experience and observation of his own. Though he made St. Catherine of Genoa the ground-work, as it were, of his teaching, yet one can feel that he studies her from a twentieth century angle, and with the intention of teaching the twentieth century something concerning itself. Hence, in a true sense, when he analyses the modern mind he is even more at home than he is with her, even though to his readers he is not always easy to follow. For he seeks the roots and sources of men's thoughts and ideas, especially their religious ideas; he seeks to think behind them, that he may discover why they think so differently, and yet are all so sure that they are right. One answer at least which he found we have endeavoured to point out here. It is no more nor less than the opposite extremes from which the two camps, into which modern Christendom is divided, look at God. There are many other things to be learnt from the Baron's studies, but this is one which should be considered a lasting contribution to modern thought, and should prove a great step in the direction of reunion.

✠ ALBAN GOODIER.

## A NEWSPAPER DEBATE ON THE BIBLE. II.

**I**N the November number of the Month I reviewed some of the principles and opinions expressed in the prolonged symposium on the Bible to which the *Daily Telegraph* had opened its columns some short while before. It is the purpose of the present notes to offer some observations on other outstanding questions brought forward in the same debate.

Some surprising remarks were to be expected in a general discussion on religious topics—such as, for instance, that “electricity may yet have more to disclose concerning faith,” the sense apparently being that scientific advance helps us to a better understanding of religious truth. The facts of nature are in reality created patterns of divine thought, and should lead our minds to the knowledge of their Maker. Yet we know that the pursuit of science, strangely enough, does not always have this effect, though the discovery that nature is more vast and more complex than man had suspected should only deepen his reverence for Almighty God, its author. The constant addition to human knowledge of new worlds in the outer depths of space, and on this planet of ours of new creatures invisible save through the microscope, should be a warning against sceptical dogmatism. As Sir Charles Marston wrote: “The radio is familiarizing us with the presence of unseen media in our midst. The invisible is losing its unreality.”

Instances were not wanting when the Bible was made to say something very different from what is actually to be read in its pages. Thus: “We are told that the time will come when men will worship, not in this or that church or cathedral, but in spirit and in truth,” which last words have not before, I believe, been interpreted to mean “in character and in intelligence.” The problem proposed to Our Lord by the Samaritan woman was whether the one sanctuary at which God wished sacrifice to be offered in the Promised Land was at Jerusalem, as the Jews held, or on Mount Gerizim, as was maintained by the Samaritans. Our Lord answered in effect that the time had come when that question had ceased to be of living urgent importance, as now in the Messianic age the law of the unity of the sanctuary was to be abrogated.

"Woman, believe me, that the hour cometh when you shall adore the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (John iv. 21). The time had come which Malachy foretold : "In every place there is sacrifice and there is offered to my name a clean oblation ; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (i. 11). The Jews had tended to place all the value of religion in its externals to the neglect of the life of the spirit and of inward purity and virtue. This danger was acute in the time of the Pharisees, but had ever been present and had met with stern rebukes from the prophets. As Samuel said : "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord ? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (I Sam. xv. 22 : R.V.).

In another letter we read that "St. Paul writes, 'Therefore we conclude that man is justified by faith without deeds of the law,' meaning that belief in the spirit of the law, not in the meticulous observance of the form of the law, is a man's justification." Certainly it is the spirit of religion that is pleasing to God, and an outward observance of its prescribed rites divorced from the inward spirit of worship is of no avail before Him ; still, if religious practices are prescribed by divine law, it is clear that these will be carried out exactly by those imbued with the true spirit of the law. The truth, however, which St. Paul has here in mind is quite on another plane, namely that the prescribed ritual of the Old Testament was of itself incapable of conferring justification. Man is justified through faith in Christ, and, after His coming, when the old covenant was replaced by the new, men were no longer bound by the ritual precepts imposed upon the Chosen People.

The purpose of Scripture was not to reveal to men truths of the natural order concerning the constitution of the universe, and it is not surprising that the sacred writers should speak of the physical world, not as subsequent study has shown it to be but as it presents itself to the senses. In such expressions there is not the fullness of truth, but neither is there any positive error. They are true in as much as they correctly represent the appearance of things. This is the teaching with which Catholics are familiar from the *Providentissimus Deus* of Pope Leo XIII. We do not expect to find in the pages of the Bible any reference to the spheroidal shape of the earth, and when St. Jerome's version speaks of the world as an "orbis" (e.g., "in universo orbe fames praevaluit" (Gen. xli. 54), we understand the word to refer to the supposed circularity of its

superficies. None the less the other view still finds supporters. One writer quoting the psalms as they occur in the Anglican Prayer Book refers to "the rotundity of the earth mentioned in Psalm xxiv. 1 (Vulgate xxiii) and in Psalm xcvi. 10" (Vulgate xcvi.) : the phrases being, respectively, "the compass of the world" and "the round world," and the sense the same as that attached by St. Jerome to his word "orbis." In any case, the ultimate question concerns the meaning of the Hebrew *tebel*, which is the word used in both passages, and neither its root nor cognate words suggest the sense of roundness.

#### THE DELUGE.

We may now pass to the subject of the Deluge, one of the most outstanding in the whole of the Bible. A writer, whose letter was designed to point out the entire accuracy of the narrative given in Genesis, wrote that "What Noah made was a raft of poplarwood, on which he built a grass hut or two, exactly as is done to this day." This interesting suggestion is hard to square either with the nature of the flood or with the description of the Ark. When the windows or flood gates of heaven were opened and torrential rain descended, these grass huts would have afforded but sorry protection for their inmates. Every living thing would have been swept off the vessel, for such it is described in the text, and not as a raft. Its height was of 30 cubits, roughly between 40 and 50 feet (Gen. vi. 15). Moreover the material prescribed to be used in its construction was "gopher wood" (v. 14), and though the meaning is dubious, the analogy of "kopher" (pitch) suggests rather pitch-wood, some kind of resinous timber. This writer limited the flood to the region inhabited by Noe and his contemporaries, in accord with the opinion now common in the Church. Another writer, however, showed that a universal deluge covering the whole of the globe still finds its adherents. Dr. Buckland and the older school of geologists found evidence of a universal flood in the boulder formation and in erratic blocks. The argument may be seen worked out in the sixth of Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion*. However scientists soon came to realize that these phenomena can only be satisfactorily explained by the action of ice. Sir Charles Lyell wrote long ago :

Geologists were not long in seeing that the boulder formation was characteristic of high latitudes, and that on the whole size and number of erratic blocks increases

as we travel towards the Arctic regions. They could not fail to be struck with the contrast which the countries bordering the Baltic presented when compared with those surrounding the Mediterranean. The multitude of travelled blocks and striated rocks in the one region, and the absence of such appearances in the other, were too obvious to be overlooked. Even the great development of the boulder formation with large erratics so far south as the Alps offered an exception to the general rule, favourable to the hypothesis that there was some intimate connection between it and accumulations of snow and ice.

Yet in our Biblical symposium the old geological evidence found a new exponent. Mr. Riche wrote: "I am convinced that the so-called 'glacial period' was one of the phenomena produced by the Flood." He attributes the rising of the waters to a dual cause. When "the foundations of the great deep were broken up" the waters of the ocean came into contact with the interior fires of the earth, with the result that tremendous explosions occurred when the steam generated had reached its critical point.

Now steam occupies 1,400 times the space of the water which goes to form that steam, consequently the waters rose. And, as water has the habit of retaining its own level, the waters reached the Polar regions, and at the South Polar regions they came into contact with 4,000,000 square miles of "glacial ice," 4,000 to 10,000 feet thick, which floated, carrying on the undersurfaces of the bergs the "boulder-clay" which we find often deposited in the most unlikely places.

This floating ice would striate the rocks, and

in coming in contact—when floating—with the bottom of the ocean, would act like a mighty plough, and force onward shells, etc., as we find them on Moel Tryfaen.

This theory has the merit of being ingenious and original, and it is for that reason, rather than for its inherent probability, that the passage has been here transcribed. It would lead again to the old Biblical difficulties from which a geographically restricted deluge has delivered us; and on the physical side the explanation offered does not appear adequate. Steam may occupy more space than the quantity of water from which it was formed, but how long would the steam generated retain the form of steam? Forced back into contact with the cold waters of the ocean, it would speedily

return to its original liquid state, and so lose any power for raising the level of the sea. Moreover as regards Moe! Tryfaen with its well-known deposits of marine shells, occurring towards its summit, it is to be noticed that the stratum of sand and gravel in which they are found, is no less than about 35 feet thick. Such a deposit could not have been formed by the Biblical deluge, which left the earth dry within a year and ten days from its commencement.

An important communication on the subject of the flood was contributed by Lieut.-General Sir George MacMunn, who for three years during the war was Inspector-General of Communications in Mesopotamia, and held the command there in the year succeeding the armistice. He thus had exceptional opportunities of familiarizing himself with the Tigris and the Euphrates, and with local conditions generally. "A few days," he writes, "after Kut fell in the spring of 1916, I was on the Hamar Lake in my steamer, moving up the Euphrates close to Ur of the Chaldees, whose mounds could be seen far away, but save for that there was no land visible north, south, east, or west, and only now and again a palm top"; and he considers that the story of the flood "is the story of what happens each year in Iraq, only considerably intensified by unusual happenings." "The usual spring floods of rain-water and melting snow from the Armenian uplands brought a gigantic flood, and swept all before it." Moreover, "We are told that the 'Fountains of the Deep came up.' Now, to this day, every spring for forty days, the south-west 'Shumal' prevails in the Gulf, and it blows the sea water up like a wall for seventy miles and more over the dry flats of the land on either side of the rivers, but especially on the Ur side. Because of this wall the floods cannot run off the land." This is interesting and suggestive; but it does not appear adequate to explain the Biblical flood, when "the waters prevailed upon the earth 150 days" (Gen. vii. 24). Indeed he says himself, "We must allow that through the ages the story has been developed beyond its original scope." This, of course is at variance with the Catholic doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. Besides, the great change that has taken place in the configuration of the land in the last few thousand years must be borne in mind. The delta at the mouth of the two rivers is said to have increased at the rate of a mile in seventy years. As regards the resting place of the Ark, did the word translated "mountain" in the narrative always bear that meaning? Sir George suggests that it

did not, and points to the Arabic word *gebel*, which also means a mountain, yet is applied by the Arabs to-day to the low plain that lies between the Tigris and the Euphrates. Then again, perhaps, we have been too quick in recognizing the mountains of Ararat, on which the Ark rested (in the Vulgate, the mountains of Armenia) in the mountains to-day known by that name. We cannot be said yet to have arrived at a perfectly satisfactory exegesis of the deluge story, and every suggestion deserves to be carefully examined and tested to see if it helps towards a more perfect understanding of the sacred narrative.

Before leaving this subject reference may be made to a letter which sought to support the veracity of the Biblical story by appealing to the evidence of Berossus: "It is on record that Berossus, a Babylonian priest, who lived 300 B.C., discovered remains of the Ark on the higher portion of Mount Ararat, from which he says he found the natives were taking portions of bitumen for amulets." The Babylonian history of Berossus has been unfortunately lost, and the fragment here referred to has been preserved for us by Syncellus and Eusebius who borrowed it from the work of Alexander Polyhistor. It may be read in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, where it will be seen that Berossus does not claim to have seen the remains of the Ark, or ship, as he calls it, with his own eyes. This being the case, the report does not carry great weight, as it is notorious how easily rumours of this kind pass into circulation.

#### GOD IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

The story of the Flood looms large in the pages of the Bible. It strikes the imagination forcibly with its picture of the almost total destruction of the human race; and it is intended to strike into the soul of the believer a salutary horror of sin, which is in itself so hateful and loathsome that, on account of it, Almighty God was "touched inwardly with sorrow of heart," and it "repented Him that He had made man" (Gen. vi. 6, 7). This thought of the terrible punishment inflicted on men for sin in the Flood leads to the consideration of a difficulty felt by some in comparing the Old and New Testaments, and expressed by a writer in the *Daily Telegraph* as follows: "The God of the Old Testament is the terrible Jehovah; the God of the New Testament is the Merciful Father, and the two are not supplementary, but contradictory." Another wrote: "Faith in a Jehovah whose law is an

eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, induces a different frame of mind in the believer from that which faith in the loving and forgiving Father depicted in the New Testament produces, which mental state—if sincere—finds expression in a different mode of life.” And a third went so far as to say, “There are more Gods than one in the Bible.”

The second of these writers is, unintentionally, distinctly misleading. His words suggest that the law of an eye for an eye represents the dispositions of Jehovah Himself. As is clear from the Book of Exodus (c. 21) the law is part of the penal code of the Hebrew people. We have the authority of Our Lord for saying that it does not embody the highest ideal. He Himself has set before us one far more noble: “You have heard that it hath been said: An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you not to resist evil, but if one strike you on thy right cheek, turn to him also the other,” and so on. (Read Matth. vi. 38-42.) Higher ideals are proposed in the new law than in the old; but it is useless to give meat to babes. In a relatively rude and barbarous age the people were not ripe for the more sublime teaching of the New Testament, and it was wisely withheld from them. In itself the law was just, and Our Lord does not impugn its justice. But He teaches that it is nobler to forgive, and not to exact a penalty that justice allows. And to this day the state follows the law of a life for a life; and for the public good the law does not allow a private citizen so to exercise the virtue of forgiveness as to impede the exaction of the supreme penalty.

In answer to the statements quoted above a clergyman wrote: “Would it not be better to let the Old Testament speak for itself? The definite teaching which it gives of the Nature of God is that He is ‘a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy . . . . forgiving iniquity and sin.’” The passage alluded to is Jonas iv. 2. A layman countered by pointing out that a single quotation will not suffice to convey the spirit of the Old Testament, and that side by side with this conception of God as merciful and forgiving “the Old Testament does over and over again enlarge the idea of God as a terrible, avenging, destroying Jehovah.” A letter from Germany brought the sentence: “Truly to the agnostic there seems to be a mountainous difference here—but faith can remove mountains.” But there is not really a mountain here; or if there is, it is a mountain of unintentional misrepresentation, and reason

based on the careful reading of the two Testaments can help to remove it.

The teaching of the Old Law is summed up by the One best qualified to do so. When asked, "Which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind (Deut. vi. 5). This is the greatest and first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (Lev. ix. 18). On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets" (Matth. xxii. 36-40). Jehovah whose supreme desire is that His creatures shall honour Him with their love has not the hard qualities that the writers quoted above would lead us to suppose. Neither did Moses so think of Him, but as of one "merciful and gracious, patient and of much compassion, and true" (Exod. xxxiv. 6). Nor again the psalmist: "Thou, O Lord, art sweet and mild; and plenteous in mercy to all that call upon thee" (Ps. 85 (86) 5). Nor Joel, who says of God: "He is gracious and merciful, patient and rich in mercy, and ready to repent of the evil" (ii. 13). Nor the Jews of the fifth century who held God to be "a forgiving God, gracious, and merciful, longsuffering, and full of compassion" (Neh. ix. 17). Again Ps. cii. (ciii.) 8: "The Lord is compassionate and merciful; longsuffering and plenteous in mercy" (cf. Ps. cxliv (cxlv) 8, Ecclus. ii. 13). We have seen, however, how stern Jehovah could be, in that, for example, He sent a flood to destroy mankind. But these are not two contradictory pictures. Jehovah was merciful, but He was also and necessarily infinitely just. Sin is an evil that must be either repented of, in which case Jehovah is full of forgiveness, or it must be punished. This is owing to the holiness and justice of Jehovah. Though the deluge was sent as a punishment of sin, God showed His patience and long-suffering in that He foretold it long before, and thereby invited men to repentance. Had all repented, no doubt the punishment of the Flood would have been withheld, as was the threatened destruction of Nineveh when the inhabitants did penance in sack-cloth and ashes. Some, it appears, did avail themselves of the mercy of God "when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing" (I Pet. iii. 20 R.V.).

On the other hand it is not according to the text of the New Testament to say that God is there represented as the merciful and loving Father, as if the justice of God which is prominent in the Old Testament was not also placed in the foreground

of the New. "It is expedient for thee that one of thy members should perish, rather than thy whole body be cast into hell" (Matth. v. 29, 30; xviii. 9). "I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account of it in the day of judgment" (Matth. xii. 36). "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His Angels; and then will He render to every man according to his works" (Matth. xvi. 27). "And his Lord being angry, delivered him to the torturers until he paid all the debt. So shall, my Heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts" (Matth. xviii. 34, 35). Finally we may refer to Our Lord's description of the Judgment in St. Matthew, ch. 25. Thus both in the Old and in the New Testament God is at once the Loving Father, full of mercy and compassion, and also the just and stern Judge to those who will not avail themselves of His patience and repent. Nowadays there is a marked tendency to set aside the clear teaching of Our Lord on the divine attribute of justice, and to forget that He not only promises rewards to the just, but also threatens the wicked with eternal punishment. And the difficulty felt by some to-day which is summed up in the contrast between the stern Jehovah of the Old and the Loving Father of the New Testament has its roots, it is to be feared, largely in this forgetfulness of the doctrine of Christ concerning future retribution. One noticeable difference between the manner in which God's Providence over men was exercised under the old dispensation and the manner in which it is exercised under the new remains to be noticed. Under the Old Law, namely, Almighty God not infrequently inflicted physical chastisements for sin in such a way that it was publicly known to all that the punishment came from God, and for what reason it had been inflicted. This He no longer does under the new dispensation. And this difference has had some influence in the formation of the false ideas about God that we have been considering. The ancient Hebrews were spiritually less developed; their realization of the future life was comparatively dim and undefined. Striking manifestations of divine justice, shown in the punishment of sin in this world, were necessary to bring them to a sense of the gravity of disobeying the divine commands. This difference in God's government of the world argues no difference in the conception of God presented in the Old and in the New Testament. It points to a difference in men, and in their stage of spiritual evolution, which is the reason for the change in Almighty God's manner of government.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE.

## METHODS OF TEACHING RELIGION

**S**OMEONE has said—was it Edmund Burke?—that we spend much of our lives “fighting the passions and prejudices of others with passions and prejudices of our own.” This saying applies very aptly to almost all educational theories. People see so clearly the defects in their own education that when anyone sets out to form a theory of a perfect method he usually begins on a ground strewn with wreckage. Thought about education, even more than most human thought, is a story of re-actions.

Fr. McMahon, in his most interesting book “Some Methods of Teaching Religion,”<sup>1</sup> warns us against this danger in the sphere of religious doctrine. He admits, for instance, that a wrong use has been made of the Catechism, that it has been taught and learnt unreasoningly, that it has usurped too large a place in the scheme of doctrinal teaching, yet he pleads with all the devisers of new schemes to remember that there was some good in the old ones. He points out how educators have often to waste time retracing their steps—time that might have been saved had they altered and improved old methods instead of entirely discarding them. In this connection he discusses especially the Shields method. Dr. Shields<sup>2</sup> has related, in a book called “The Making and Unmaking of a Dullard,” his own childhood’s experiences. He had suffered under an inability to learn by heart, an absence of explanation of what he was expected to memorize, a painful lack of understanding and encouragement. Anxious to save other children from the same sufferings he discards the Catechism and *all* memory work and substitutes illustrated readers arranged progressively for each school grade.

The history of the way in which the Catechism has usurped more than its rightful place is an interesting one. Before the Reformation, although Catechisms existed, the teaching of religion was normally done through sermons, through the pictures and statues in the Churches and through the Liturgy. Most of the “newest” methods are an appeal for a fuller return to this age-long practice of the Church. It was natural

<sup>1</sup> Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. xiv. 265. Price, 7s. 6d.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Shields was Head of the Department of Education in the Catholic University of America, Washington, and Founder and Dean of the Catholic Sisters’ College.

that Luther and the other reformers with their exclusive reliance on the written word should have substituted the system of a Compendium of Doctrine in the form of question and answer to be learnt by heart. Catholics felt they must reply to these heretical Catechisms with orthodox ones, and there is no doubt that many of the Catechisms in use in various countries are wonderful in the completeness and accuracy with which they set out Catholic doctrine in concise, almost tabloid, form. Yet they are dangerous as machinery for teaching in the hands of lazy or incompetent teachers. It is so easy to make children learn by heart; most of them have the greatest possible facility in memorizing. It is so troublesome, on the other hand, to make sure they are understanding what they are taught. And the teacher takes refuge in the formula "Let them learn it now. They will come to understand it later."

Against all this the leading Catholic educators of to-day unite in entering a vigorous protest. All teaching, secular as well as religious, is tending to become more psychological and more objective. Modern educators say, with Cardinal Newman, that "it is no gain to have enlarged the memory at the cost of faculties indubitably higher." They ask that the nature of the child should be first considered in deciding how to teach him and that more use should be made of his hands, eyes, and ears and of the material objects that surround him in daily life. Catholic teaching is not only affected by this general movement but has by the very nature of the Church a special affinity with it. It is likely to be more successfully psychological than any other because God Who made the Child also made the Church. It is likely to be more objective since "Christianity is a history, supernatural, and almost scenic: it tells us what its Author is, by telling us what He has done" (Newman).

The best methods then in which the school can show forth this "almost scenic" religion will tend more and more to be an analysis and systematizing of what the Catholic mother does for her child at home and what the Church does for it by Mass, the Sacraments and all worship. Fr. McMahon indeed says that "What comes to the mother naturally must be cultivated by the teacher."

And as in the old days the place of the Catechism was held by the sermon, so the objective *and* the psychological element in religious teaching can all be found in the Church's liturgy, if teachers will but make use of this treasure house.

Fr. Drinkwater, whose *Sower* Scheme Fr. McMahon praises highly, feels this very fully. He does not propose like Dr. Shields that the Catechism be jettisoned entirely, and he advocates memory work on hymns and prayers because "such things made of the language of poetry and life enter the mind and nourish it." But he sees the chief religious training of children as taking place in the Sanctuary. They should have everything they *do* in Church explained to them; should if possible, have some real share in the life of their Parish Church :

When the school is allowed and encouraged to do things in the Church, to be responsible on occasions for the singing of Mass or Benediction, to answer the Priest corporately at Mass, to undertake the ordinary service of the Altar, to perform a Christmas mystery play, and so on . . . religious instruction gets the stimulus and reality through constantly having real purposes and real projects to work for.

As to school hours, the most original and interesting point in the *Sower* scheme is the suggestion that the children should make their own Catechisms. Books are given them for the purpose or large sheets of paper which they can sew together and cover according to their individual tastes. Into these books the questions they are to memorize are written, accompanied by explanations. Pictures cut from books and magazines and old Christmas cards are to be pasted in as illustrations and the older children are encouraged to write their own comments or copy favourite prayers beneath the pictures. In this way their apprehension of what they are learning gets more and more real. (Fr. McMahon makes much use of Newman's distinction between a "notional" and a "real" apprehension as applied to children.) They are, too, making a precious memorial of their school days and often show, we are told, much real taste and originality in their work.

The Shields method is, as we have said, far more drastic than the *Sower* method in its sweeping away both of the Catechism and of all other memory work. It proceeds on the very interesting theory that religion should not with the small child be taught as a separate subject but should be made the heart and centre of all teaching. Thus the Shields *First Book* is a General Reader. It teaches the beginnings of nature study, art, domestic life, besides religion, and it is in this book that the child is to be taught to read. Dr.

Shields takes the instincts of the child, the need for love, food, protection, remedy and a model for his conduct. For these the child turns naturally towards his parents "And in the same instincts the attitude of the Christian towards God is foreshadowed."

Dr. Shields wants then to seize these natural instincts and spiritualize them. "Clearly therefore the first and most important work in the teaching of religion, especially in the teaching of religion to young children, is that which is concerned with (1) the cultivation of the instincts, and with (2) the lifting of them into Christian virtues."

Like Fr. Drinkwater, Dr. Shields sees the need of action for the children that they may learn rather than merely be taught. He wants them to grow from within even if this be a slow work. And he seizes two psychological points, often ignored but of capital importance. From his own unhappy youth he realizes the need of constant encouragement for children and he sees that that encouragement is best given by *helping them to do* something successfully. The other point he notes is emphasized by other teachers: the quickness of the child to weigh the importance given to religion in relation to other subjects. There is an immense danger in these days of public examinations that teachers should come to look on secular subjects as mattering most, and this the child quickly "senses." Dr. Shields inveighs against the "3 cent Catechism" and he makes his own Readers beautiful in get-up and illustration that they may be at least equal in external appearance to the other books in a child's satchel. This he holds, and Dr. Yorke and Fr. McMahon agree with him, is a matter of immense importance: a child *cannot* think that subject most important the book about which is cheapest and shabbiest.

Dr. Yorke, whose system is in use in the schools of California puts the same case strongly:

The Catholic people give generously to the support of the school, not because their children cannot get secular education elsewhere, but because nowhere else can they obtain a religious education. In the face of this generosity, we sometimes hang our heads when we find pastor and teachers carried away by an unholy emulation and stressing the secular subjects to the neglect of religion.

Pious and zealous men erect palatial school houses, but

when it comes to the teaching the children must be content with the penny Catechism, because other religious text books would cost a little more. The end for which the school was built was to teach religion, and religion is the only cheap thing about the school.

The Yorke Method is as closely examined by Fr. McMahon as the Shields and *Sower* Methods, but on the whole the preference is given to the others because they begin with the child, while Dr. Yorke "begins with the subject matter." Fr. McMahon is also inclined to think that the Yorke Method makes too much memorizing of the Catechism compulsory and in this matter he cites the *Sower* as holding the best middle course.

But Fr. McMahon is writing not merely as a theorist who prepares a thesis on education but as a man of immense practical experience, as Inspector of Catholic Schools and Organizer of Religious Instruction for the diocese of Perth in Western Australia. He does not therefore merely outline other methods but goes on to speak of his own, into which he has incorporated much from other systems but which has also a note of originality.

Dr. McMahon's is the "Project Method" of teaching religion, with the Mass as the chief "project." The children are to be taught chiefly through action, and the centre of that action is to be the Holy Sacrifice. First, they are to make Mass Books, like the *Sower* Catechisms, illustrated not only with pictures but with representations of Altar furniture. They are to be taught all about vestments, Altar linen, liturgical colours. They are to learn to prepare an altar for Mass; to go to a table, pick up an amice or alb or cruet and say instantly what is its purpose and meaning. Other "projects" will be the making of a Map of Palestine, a scripture-reading project or a mystery play. But the liturgy and the Mass are to be the chief centre of activity and the chief means of learning.

One class in the primary school undertook the making of a model sanctuary as a "co-operative project." It began

by a diligent search through catalogues for illustrations of Altars, Altar furniture, and sanctuary fittings. A class scrap-book was used to file the results. Several visits were made to the church, and object lessons were conducted on the Altar. We divided the Class into Committees and called for designs for our Altar. Several

groups worked in plasticene models. The design is accepted. The boys are set to make the Altar and fixtures, the girls are to make the vestments, Altar linen and Sanctuary decorations.

This was before the age of twelve! There followed a Reference Book on the Mass, Study Circles of which

- the aim was twofold : *first* to introduce the pupils into the many-sided wonders of the Mass—history, liturgy, theology—in the hope that the interest might be awakened in the individual which would be confirmed in after-school years; *secondly*, to foster the ideal of the lay apostolate, so that our children leaving school may know the terms in which to describe our liturgy to Protestants.

Other projects were an Altar Society, a Weekly Calendar for posting up in the Church Porch, finally all these culminated in the children learning how to use a Missal : making it "the happy meeting ground of all we do in religious education; tradition, history, Sacred Scripture, dogma, devotion, are epitomized within its pages."

It is pleasant indeed to read of the "encouraging results" of this splendid programme already achieved in Australia. Like the other methods outlined by Fr. McMahon the "project" method has one disadvantage—which may, however, from another viewpoint be deemed an advantage. It calls for competent and zealous teachers if it is to achieve success. In my own extreme youth I was once set to teach a class of small children and asked desperately how I should set about it, knowing nothing whatever about children or teaching. I was told : "Don't worry; just drive the Catechism into their heads. They'll understand it later." Did they?

But anyhow teachers of the *Sower* or the Project Methods *must* "worry." They must prepare their lessons; they must study children. Fr. McMahon speaks sadly enough of the way in which he has seen teachers give admirable, well-prepared lessons in secular subjects and then come to the teaching of religion listless, indifferent, unprepared. This the children quickly sense, with dire results.

Dr. Yorke and Dr. Shields both implore teachers to prepare their religious lessons by thought and prayer, making them the subject of their own personal morning meditation. And all the methods discussed in "Some Methods of Teaching Religion" call for greater personal effort from the teacher even than from the class. Fr. McMahon sums it all up by

saying that the teacher should talk less but think more—thus leading the pupils to think more also.

Such books as this are of course an immense help to a teacher who wants to be helped, but no book and no method can itself *do* the work. Teaching remains a highly personal matter and the best teacher will still get the best results. And I think this personal element is what chiefly enters in on the one point on which Fr. McMahon joins issue with Fr. Drinkwater. He thinks that the latter is wrong in seeking to banish Apologetics from secondary schools. Yet surely one would gather from Fr. Drinkwater's paper published in the November *Month* that the attack he makes on the teaching of Apologetics is in reality an attack on the *bad* teaching of Apologetics. For he says that what the children have learnt will "clatter down in their minds at the first touch of a real difficulty stated with sincerity and vividness."

If they have been badly taught, this is true, but if well taught they are far more likely to know already the "live" difficulty and the "live" answer. One must agree with Fr. McMahon that the mass of the difficulties they will encounter on leaving school cannot be met merely by their having learnt Apologetics through history (Fr. Drinkwater's suggested substitute). And surely it is better for a child to hear the difficulties while in a Catholic atmosphere where some attempt may be made to give him also an answer, than to hear them later in a pagan atmosphere with no one to help him to the answer?

But we must go even further. Will the child really hear only in later life the questions and difficulties, or has he not heard them already? There is surely a danger of talking as though we could see to it, in this question of education, that the children only hear what we tell them. Some years ago I was asked to take a class in Apologetics at a certain Convent, but begged by the nuns not to put difficulties into the girls' minds. I asked a nun to be present to overlook my lessons. But one day she was called away. The children crowded round me asking questions, and I think there was scarcely a difficulty to be met among grown up people which these youngsters had not got in their heads. At another convent not known to me personally a former pupil told me that she at least was convinced that the Junior Evidence Guild started there was closed down because the nuns could not answer the girls' questions. This may easily have been untrue, but it was unfortunate that it was believed. We may be quite cer-

tain that the present generation of children do not wait until after school to meet "live" difficulties. What they are looking for is answers.

Yet Fr. Drinkwater's objection is entirely sound as against a good deal of the current apologetic teaching, and I should like to suggest a few ways in which the teacher could be aided in handling this extremely difficult branch of his or her work.<sup>1</sup>

(1) The most important question is that of atmosphere. Fr. Drinkwater has said somewhere that the Church is not a citadel to be defended but an army on the march. If the word "Apologetics" could be exchanged for "Catholic Evidence" I feel there would be an improvement in the direction of realizing and utilizing this idea in instruction. The teacher must aim at a beginning of the Lay Apostolate. The children learn about their religion not simply to defend their own faith but to teach it to others. When a young speaker at a C.E.G. class gets questions of a heckling type he is taught to make each question an occasion for explaining some bit of doctrine. That is the atmosphere wanted in Secondary Schools.

(2) This atmosphere is greatly helped by making, as Fr. McMahon suggests, the study of scripture and of the Church's life and liturgy all serve a double purpose: the deepening of the children's own Catholic life and a preparation to explain it to others.

(3) The teacher should welcome the expression of the children's difficulties, but make it clear to them that they cannot hope to get an answer immediately to every possible difficulty. They, too, must think and will sometimes find their own answers. But the teacher, besides ultimately solving the leading questions, should aim at indicating to the class certain main lines along one or other of which the answers to most questions are to be sought. So that while it is not possible to deal in school explicitly with every objection to the faith, yet the pupils will be trained to meet every objection. They should be taught:

(a) To distinguish between the divine and the human side of the Church; (b) between Faith and Reason; (c) something of the relations of Faith and Science; (d) that a heresy is generally a truth exaggerated and out of proportion, so that they may not be surprised to find elements of truth in other re-

<sup>1</sup> After my two stories I should like to add that most convents seem to have these ideas so definitely in mind that the teaching on this subject is surely on the up-grade.

ligions ; (e) something about the Rule of Faith ; (f) something of religions founded by men in relation to the religion founded by God.

This is not an impossible programme for the children in a Secondary School with a well-equipped teacher and I am certain it is needed as a preparation for the world of to-day, if that world is to be Catholicized instead of Catholics being paganized.

Lastly how should all this be taught? Fr. McMahon speaks of the Catechetical method (not the mere memorizing of Catechism but free question and answer) as the most ancient method of the Church, the method which Our Lord used when He sat in the midst of the doctors "hearing them and asking them questions." By those questions the Divine Teacher was giving knowledge to men who could have received it in no other way.

Cardinal Newman has, in one of his greatest passages, likened the Church to her Divine Founder in her attitude to the world, as she has "from the first looked round upon the earth noting and visiting the doctrines she found there. . . . Wherever she went, in trouble or in triumph, still she was a living spirit, the mind and voice of the Most High 'sitting in the midst of the doctors both hearing them and asking them questions'; *claiming to herself what they said rightly, correcting their errors, supplying their defects, completing their beginnings, expanding their surmises.*'"

I have italicized this last passage because, bold as it seems, I think nothing less should be the aim of our Catholic teachers, as their own attitude and that which they aim at producing in their pupils. If by religious instruction we can get our young Catholics first to realize that the Church is the home of all truth wherever they find it, and secondly to know enough of Her teaching to fit in the truth while discarding the error, we shall have a generation at once firm in the faith and sympathetic to truth outside the Fold.

Fr. McMahon's book, it will be gathered, will prove of immense value to all those to whom has been entrusted the sublime task of religious education.

M. J. SHEED.

## MARY WARD'S GREAT ENTERPRISE

### V

**I**N his letter of May 12th,<sup>1</sup> announcing the final dissolution of the House of St. Catherine, the Nuncio Consalvi suggested that the obedience shown by the Archbishop of Mechlin in carrying out the wishes of Propaganda, should be held up as an example to Francis Van der Burch, who so far had made no effort to suppress the "Jesuitesses" within his Archdiocese of Cambrai. Ingoli readily accepted the suggestion and, on July 10, wrote accordingly to the Archbishop.<sup>2</sup> In the negotiations that followed, the same features were reproduced as in those connected with St. Catherine's; houses which had nothing to do with Mary Ward's Institute being suppressed, while its one foundation at St. Omers escaped notice for months.

In the Archdiocese of Cambrai, in order to provide for the crying need of education as a preservative of the Faith, several schools for girls had been conducted for some years by two distinct societies: the Filles de Notre Dame founded at Tournai in 1598, and the Daughters of St. Agnes founded at Arras in 1601. Their members wore no distinctive habit, but, whilst taking a vow of chastity, made a promise of obedience to the Superior of the house. It was these societies that Ingoli confounded with the Institute of Mary Ward and called upon the Archbishop to suppress. The latter, realizing the confusion and appreciating better than those beyond the Alps the vital importance of these educational establishments in a country that had been over-run by heresy, made a spirited effort to save them. In his letter to Rome of September 6, 1629, he gave a full description of these congregations within his archdiocese and paid a glowing tribute to their work. Their members, it was true, had been mockingly called "Jesuitesses" by their ill-wishers, but they were in no way subject to the Jesuits nor did they follow their rule. They were not indeed religious. With the "Jesuitesses" of Liege, who, if the charges made against them were true, might well be proceeded against, these congregations had never had any

<sup>1</sup> Cf. THE MONTH, September, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> "Pr. Arch. Lett. volg." 1629, vol. 8, fol. 111b.

connection. Nor had he himself erected them. They had been called into existence by the needs of the time—to stay the ravages of heresy—before he became Archbishop. Moreover, as the members had expended on the schools large sums from the dowries—in Mons alone at least 70,000 gulden—the suppression would inflict upon them very severe losses and throw them back upon their families for support. It could, too, cast a slur upon their reputation which up to that time had been without reproach, and give rise to serious inconvenience and scandal.<sup>1</sup>

Not satisfied, however, with explaining the situation to the authorities of Propaganda, the Archbishop, a few days later, fearing lest any immediate steps might be taken by the Nuncio, wrote informing him that the threatened suppression had caused considerable agitation among the people. Several towns had at once sent deputies to make representations to the Government, on account of it. One of these had declared to him that, as these congregations were not Religious Orders, they were the concern of the State alone; and on his being referred by the Archbishop to the law of the Church in the matter, had answered that it applied only to Religious Orders strictly so-called. The Archbishop, further, stressed the point that the Bull of Pius V., requiring papal enclosure, had never been received in Flanders and that Cardinal Bellarmine at a later date, in a letter to Francis de Sales, had expressed approval of such congregations as these. He earnestly, therefore, begged the Nuncio to take no measures against those in his Archdiocese, as he was shortly expecting this recognition from Rome.<sup>2</sup>

The expectation of the Archbishop was far from justified by the result. To his explanation of the confusion concerning the congregations, the Secretary of Propaganda very inconsequently replied by sending him the charges against the "Jesuitesses" taken from the reports which Harrison and Kellicott had drawn up some years previously.<sup>3</sup> The mordant comments, too, especially those directed against the Archbishop, which Ingoli appended to the latter's letter of September 6 reveal in what spirit it was received. All the reasons which it urged for the maintenance of the congregations were

<sup>1</sup> "Pr. Arch. Belg. s. Fland." *Jesuitissae usque ad annum 1648 inclus*, vol. 205, fol. 291. Cf. Guilday, "English Refugees," p. 197 ff.

<sup>2</sup> "Pr. Arch." *Ibid.* fol. 297. Cf. Grisar, *Stimmen der Zeit*, May, 1927, p. 136.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Guilday, p. 200, and *THE MONTH*, July, p. 43 ff.

brusquely swept aside. No matter what the times demanded, the law of the Church enforced papal enclosure on all communities of women,—a debatable point even in those days ;—if they did not observe it, they must be suppressed. As for the financial loss which suppression would inflict on the members, that could be provided against ; but even should it prove unavoidable, it were better to act according to the Bull of Pius V. and suppress the congregations. Theirs was the blame, who had joined an institute founded in opposition to papal decrees. Nor would there be any slur on their reputation,—a worthless objection,—for the reason of the suppression was already known : the prohibition of such congregations by the law of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

The Archbishop's letters, indeed, though they gave Propaganda its first intimation that under the name "Jesuitesses" were comprised several distinct and independent communities, did not avert the blow that threatened his own congregations, and, as regards the Institute of Mary Ward, led only to more determined efforts being made to carry out, once and for all, its suppression. In its session of September 30, at which a letter of the Archbishop—probably that to the Nuncio—was discussed, Propaganda passed a resolution to that effect;<sup>2</sup> and on October 12, instructions were sent to the Nuncios at Vienna, Brussels, and Cologne, to take every possible means to bring to a definite conclusion the suppression of the English "Jesuitesses."<sup>3</sup>

There were, however, besides the Archbishop's letter, other reasons for this renewed determination. It appears that Propaganda at this time first became explicitly aware of the Institute's latest foundation, the house at Pressburg, and felt considerable annoyance and misgiving on account of it.<sup>4</sup> Added to this, the chief citizens of Naples had early in September addressed a letter to Cardinal Barberini, highly praising the work and conduct of the "English Ladies" and petitioning earnestly for their return to the city.<sup>5</sup> These events, coupled with the Archbishop's letters and the comparatively recent petition to the Pope by Mary Ward in person, for the con-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Grisar, *Stimmen*, April, 1927, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Grisar, *Stimmen*, May, p. 135.

<sup>3</sup> "Pr. Arch. Lett. volg.", 1629, vol. 8, fol. 156, 161.

<sup>4</sup> It is incorrect to say, as does Fr. Grisar, that it was first known in Rome at this time ; months previously it had been reported to Cardinal Barberini, the Secretary of State. Cf. Caraffa to Barberini, June 7, Pallotto to Barberini, September 13, 1628 : Kiewning, "Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland," I., Nos. 28, 97.

<sup>5</sup> Given in Fridl : "Englische Tugend-Schul." Bk. III. Additio Liter.

firmation of the Institute, may possibly have been interpreted by Propaganda as a widespread and concerted opposition to its measures and have thus led to renewed efforts to carry them into effect.

On the other hand, Propaganda may have been confirmed in its view that suppression was an urgent necessity, by the grave accusations against the "Jesuitesses" that began to be made at this time by a certain Andrea Trevigi. This gentleman, of Italian origin, occupied the post of court-physician at Brussels, and enjoyed considerable influence with the Archduchess Isabella. For some years past, vehemently hostile to the Society of Jesus, he was at this period actively engaged in obstructing the foundation, recommended by the Archbishop of Cambrai, of its College at Ath.<sup>1</sup> His letters are full of vituperation and calumnies against the Jesuits, "wolves," as he once calls them, and suggest his acquaintance with that malignant forgery, already in 1616 condemned by Rome, the "Monita Secreta." His literary onslaught on the "Jesuitesses" is really a thinly veiled attack on the Society. He himself allows that his letters may give the impression of being inspired by passion against the Jesuits; really, however, he asserts, it is only zeal for God's glory that forces him to write. For him, every community, however remotely connected with the Fathers of the Society, is a house of "Jesuitesses." He discovers them everywhere. They may be called Benedictines, Ursulines, and so on; but that is only Jesuit guile. Their habit and rule proclaim their true character under the disguise of a false name. Concerning all the various communities he sends to Rome every scandalous story that with much expense to himself he has been able to discover from hear-say evidence. Writing after the Institute had been suppressed by Urban VIII., he declares that the Bull of Suppression is the touchstone to the power of the Jesuits. They are doing everything to prevent its execution, though it was they who obtained it from the Pope. All the Bishops are in their hands. He, Trevigi, alone upholds the Bull and would himself be in danger of his life, were it not for the protection afforded by the Infanta. These letters, indeed, leave on one a strong impression that the poor man was mentally unbalanced. And it is certainly remarkable, as Fr. Grisar points out, that Ingoli and Propaganda should have taken them so seriously,

<sup>1</sup> On Trevigi cf. Poncelet: "Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Anciens Pays-Bas." T. I., i., p. 498 and T. I., ii., p. 272.

and with one exception, handed them over at once to the Inquisition as valuable material in the proceedings against the Institute and the Belgian congregations. Unfortunately, only the letters of 1631 are extant,<sup>1</sup> though it is certain that Trevigl began his venomous correspondence a good deal earlier; for Ingoli wrote on September 15, 1629, thanking him for his information and this time sent it back to the Nuncio for verification.<sup>2</sup>

With the injunction, already mentioned, of October 12, ordering anew the suppression of the English "Jesuitesses," a second letter was sent to the Nuncio at Brussels, telling him to verify whether the congregations in the archdiocese of Cambrai were distinct from them, but adding quite in the spirit of Ingoli that even should they prove to be distinct, Propaganda was of opinion that they came under the canons and the decrees of the Pope.<sup>3</sup> Eventually, three houses of these congregations were suppressed and the rest considerably modified in their constitutions.

Meanwhile, owing doubtless to the above investigation enjoined upon the Nuncio, the one house of the Institute in the Archdiocese—that at St. Omer—came at length to his notice. On November 20, 1629, the decree of suppression was sent to the Bishop of the city. Prolonged negotiations, however, must have ensued, though there is no record of them; for it was only in the middle of the following year that the house was finally suppressed; the Nuncio adding in his report of it "con detta estintione qui non restà altro collegio di Giesuitesse Inglese."<sup>4</sup>

Some months before this event, the distinction between the Institute and the other communities had come to be clearly recognized.<sup>5</sup> That Propaganda, indeed, persisted in its confusion for so long a period is a remarkable fact, and all the more remarkable, because Mary Ward herself was in Rome during this time, petitioning the Pope for confirmation of her work. Despite the very precarious state of her health, she had left Munich at the beginning of the year (1629) and though

<sup>1</sup> "Pr. Arch. Belg. s. Fland. Jesuitissae usque ad annum 1648." inclus., vol. 205 fol. 312 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Letter of October 12.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Grisar. *Ibid.* May, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> In July, 1630. Cf. Guilday, p. 201. In his letter of May 25, 1630, the Nuncio wrote that he was expecting the report of it. Cf. "Pr. Arch. Belg. s. Fland. Jesuitissae, etc., " vol. 205, fol. 398.

<sup>5</sup> In December, 1629. Cf. *infra*.

more than once at death's door during the journey, had reached Rome in February, alive indeed, but completely exhausted. From her sick-bed, to which she was confined for three weeks after her arrival, she dictated to one of her companions a full account of the life and work of herself and her associates since the inception of the Institute in 1609. This, as soon as she was sufficiently recovered, she presented to the Pope and the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, and again obtained from Urban VIII. the favour of having her affairs discussed by a small commission of four Cardinals. Before this commission she appeared in person to plead for her Institute, explaining its origin and character, the toils and sufferings it had caused her, the welcome given to it by the Catholic sovereigns in Flanders, Bavaria, and Austria, its commendation by several Bishops and the favour shown to it by Paul V. and Gregory XV. Her one desire, she declared, was that the Will of God should be accomplished in her and her companions. In fidelity to Him, however, she herself could not change her plans nor undertake others in their stead; but would humbly submit to those in whose hands lay the decision. "What was not done in one year, could be done in another. She could attend God Almighty His time and leisure, for man had to follow; not go before Him."

According to her biographers, her words made a deep impression on her hearers, and one of them, Cardinal Borgia, is said to have declared to the Pope "that he held it (the Institute) to be of God, and that he neither could nor durst be against it, nor was his power enough to assist it, such and so powerful were her enemies. Therefore he humbly entreated His Holiness he might deal no more in it."<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, neither the competence, nor the further history of the Commission is revealed by the sources. That the petition for confirmation was rejected is clear both from the letters of Ingoli<sup>2</sup> and from the events that followed. A further question, which the sources leave obscure, is the length of Mary Ward's stay in the eternal city. It is a matter of some consequence, for, if she left Rome in 1629, as her biographers generally assert, then her very important letter addressed from Rome on April 6, 1630, which will be discussed later, would not be authentic. The report, however, of the Nuncio

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Chambers. *Mary Ward.* II., p. 294.  
<sup>2</sup> Ingoli to Caraffa, March 26, and July 20, 1630.

of Cologne, February 15, 1630<sup>1</sup> and the fact that the plague forced her, on her return journey, to Vienna, to make a detour to Venice, would lead us to ascribe her departure from Rome to 1630.<sup>2</sup>

In her "design of going to Rome, Mary Ward, as we have seen had been urgently seconded by Pallotto, the Imperial Nuncio."<sup>3</sup> He had hoped by that means to be troubled no further with the question of the suppression. It proved a vain hope; for, after the dissolution of St. Catherine's at Brussels, Ingoli improving on the advice of Consa mentioned above, sent an account of it to Pallotto, urging him not to show himself behind the Brussels Nuncio in zeal.<sup>4</sup> The letter made little impression at Vienna. Beyond communicating its contents to the Archbishop, Cardinal Klesl, and promising that a visitation would be made of the Institute in his Nunciature, Pallotto did nothing.<sup>5</sup> On September 25, 1629 he wrote to the Secretary, informing him that the "Jesuitesses" of St. Catherine's whom the Archbishop of Mechlin had suppressed, were in no way connected with the "English Ladies" at Vienna, and pointedly added that the Emperor favoured these not only on account of the Duke of Bavaria's recommendation, but because of the nobility of their life and their utility for education. Further instance of Ingoli in October in consequence of Propaganda's renewed determination to carry through the suppression, met with no result.<sup>6</sup> Presumably the difficulties to be met with on the side of the Emperor were thought to be too great. But quite apart from this, Propaganda was really stultifying its own directions by its confusion between the Institute and the Belgian community. This was again brought to its notice by Cardinal Klesl, in a vigorous letter of November 17, in which he further declared that as the Mother General of the "English Ladies" was in Rome, the matter should be brought to a definite conclusion there, or else definite orders should be given to the Bishops to sup-

<sup>1</sup> Caraffa reported that Archbishop Ferdinand of Cologne had asked for a postponement in executing the suppression, on the ground that the Mother General was in Rome treating of her affairs. The Archbishop would not have urged this as a reason for delay, had he not been well informed of the fact by the members in Cologne and Liège. Cf. "Pr. Arch. Lett. di Spagna, Port. etc.," 1630, vol. 98, fol. 149.

<sup>2</sup> The great plague of Milan occurred in 1630.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. THE MONTH, September, p. 235.

<sup>4</sup> Ingoli to Pallotto, June 30, 1629. "Pr. Arch. Lett. volg." 1629, vol. 8, fol. 102b.

<sup>5</sup> Pallotto to Barberini, September 25, 1629. *Apud Kiewning, II.*, p. 320, note 2.

<sup>6</sup> Ingoli to Pallotto, October 12. "Pr. Arch. Lett. volg." 1629, vol. 8, fol. 161

press them: otherwise it would be impossible to get His Majesty and the other Princes to act.<sup>1</sup> It was this letter, apparently, that finally made clear to Propaganda the distinction between the Institute and the Belgian Communities; and in the renewed orders of December 8, it was expressly intimated to the Nuncios that only the "Jesuitesses" of English origin were to be suppressed.<sup>2</sup> These definite injunctions, however, had no more effect in Vienna than the preceding ones. Months later, Cardinal Klesl apparently contemplated taking measures against the Institute but was held back by the members asserting that they were approved or tolerated in Rome.<sup>3</sup> He seems to have misinterpreted it as an interference from Rome with his rights as Archbishop and reported it in a rather testy letter, declaring his perplexity and that if the jurisdiction of an Ordinary had been taken from him, religion could not continue, scandals would ensue, etc.<sup>4</sup> Ingoli thereupon made another effort to have the suppression carried out in the Imperial Nunciature. He turned to Ciriaco Rocci who had been sent there as a second Nuncio in May, 1630, and entrusted him with the task.<sup>5</sup> Rocci in reply made fair promises to co-operate with Propaganda, but stressed the difficulties Pallotto had had to contend with,<sup>6</sup> and in spite of a further pressing letter from Ingoli, in November,<sup>7</sup> in the event did nothing. The Institute remained unaffected within the Imperial Nunciature till its solemn condemnation by the Pope in 1631.

In Munich,<sup>8</sup> also, Ingoli experienced the same failure, and the foundation there survived even the Bull of Suppression. But strangest thing of all, even in Rome itself no steps were taken to enforce the decree of Propaganda. In the proceedings against the other establishments of the Institute, the members more than once pleaded for a stay of execution precisely

<sup>1</sup> "Pr. Arch. Lett. di Germ. e Boemia," 1629, vol. 70, fol. 16.

<sup>2</sup> "Pr. Arch. Lett. volg." 1629, vol. 8, fol. 180b, 181.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Klesl's letter of September (?), 1630. "Pr. Arch. Lett. di Germ. e Boemia," 1630, vol. 71, fol. 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 37v.

<sup>6</sup> Letter of Rocci, October 18. *Ibid.* fol. 27.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Letter of Rocci, November 30, 1630. "Pr. Arch. Lett. di Germ. e Boemia," 1630, vol. 72, fol. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Fr. Grisar suggests that the reason why the foundation at Munich was not interfered with was because of the uncertainty as to which nunciature, Cologne or Vienna, Munich belonged. Winifred Wigmore, however, who had lived some years at Munich, states that "at the court of Bavaria there was no Nuncio but if any matter of importance occurred it was remitted to the Nuncio at Lucerne." Chambers, II, 303.

on this ground—the toleration and continuance of the house in Rome.<sup>1</sup> And though Ingoli officially denied the fact,<sup>2</sup> his own notes prove clearly that he knew it to be true; for on the back of Cardinal Klesl's letter, mentioned above, he thus recorded the resolution of the Congregation held on October 1, 1630:—"To treat with Cardinal Gineto (Vicar of Rome) that he may see to the suppression. They are not to live together nor wear any religious habit. If tolerated in Rome suppression in Germany will be impossible."<sup>3</sup>

Thus two years after the decree of Propaganda had been passed, in Naples and Flanders alone had Ingoli been able to carry out his plans of suppression.

LEO HICKS.

(*To be concluded.*)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Letter of Ferdinand of Cologne to the Nuncio, May 22, 1630. "Pr. Arch, Lett. di Spagna, Port, etc.," 1630, vol. 98, fol. 170, and Klesl's letter of September. ut supra.

<sup>2</sup> Ingoli's note dated July 9 on back of Caraffa's letter of June 7, 1630. *Ibid.* 172v, and Ingoli to Caraffa, July 20, 1630.

<sup>3</sup> "Pr. Arch. Lett. di Germ. e Boemia," 1630, vol. 71, fol. 37v.

## EMANCIPATION OATHS AND PAPAL PREROGATIVES

**I**N the October issue of *THE MONTH*'s scholarly contemporary, the *Downside Review*, a recent biography of Cardinal Bellarmine received very kindly notice from Abbot Butler. Naturally, the major part of the notice is devoted to the sections in the book that deal with the famous Oath of Allegiance of King James I. Bellarmine was the King's chief opponent in this matter, and Bellarmine's biographer, as is the way of biographers, put up a defence of his hero's attitude. Abbot Butler criticizes the defence, but so fair and friendly is his criticism that the defendant is emboldened to continue the discussion. This he does in no mere spirit of self-justification, but rather as one seeking light on an obscure and difficult problem that still to-day, as in the days of Bellarmine and Bishop Milner, shuffles like some uneasy ghost through the peaceful precincts of theology. It is the problem of the Pope's power in temporal matters, and what a fine bogey it can be made we all know well since Mr. Gladstone showed us.

Bellarmino held, with a host of other Catholic authorities, that the Pope is possessed of indirect temporal power. His argument is based on a doctrine of societies that has lost nothing of its validity with the passage of time. The world is full of societies, enjoying each its own measure of autonomy. We have the family, the parish council, the town council, the county council, the various Government departments, the universities, the clubs and learned bodies, the business corporations, etc. All these smaller societies are plainly subordinate to the great society within which they exist, the State, and the reason why they are subordinate is because their ends and purposes are subordinate to the State's ends and purposes. The primary end of the State is the temporal well-being, peace and security of the whole social organism, and this must obviously take precedence of any lesser good, such as the prosperity or happiness of some particular section of the community. Over against the State stands the Catholic Church, the only other perfect and sovereign society in the world. Both powers are ordained by God, and the authority which each wields is a participation of the authority of

God Himself. The primary and direct end of the Church is the eternal well-being and salvation, not of the citizens of one State only, but of all mankind. As this is plainly a higher end than that of the State, the State must in a true sense be subordinate to the Church, subordinate, that is, in all matters pertaining to conscience and salvation. This is the plain teaching of such great Pontiffs as Gregory VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., Pius IX. and Leo XIII., and it is the foundation of the theory of the Pope's indirect power in temporals. As all Christian history witnesses, politics and religion cannot be kept apart, for there are many questions of "mixed" jurisdiction in which both are immediately concerned. Such questions are marriage and education laws, regulations with regard to the holding of property, etc. When a dispute arises between Church and State on any such question, which is to have the final word? If we say the State we deny the subordination taught by the Popes and fall into Erastianism; if we say the Church we admit the indirect power of the Pope as taught by Cardinal Bellarmine.

Working out his theory, the Cardinal maintained, in accordance with the views of his theological predecessors and the practice of the Popes right down to our day, that in the Holy See is vested a genuine, God-given right to nullify and invalidate such laws and enactments of civil rulers as would tend to the spiritual detriment of their subjects. Further, he held that in exceptional cases of anti-Christian misgovernment, and in circumstances favourable to its operation this right might lawfully be used to free subjects from their duty of civil allegiance. All constitutional theory admits what is called the "sacred right of rebellion," *i.e.*, the right of subjects to depose rulers whose government fails in the object of all government, the well-being of the governed. If it rests with the people at large to determine at what point of misgovernment their right of rejection comes into play, it is not unreasonable that the Pope as custodian of morality should have a similar prerogative. Again, it is certain that an unjust law is no law, and on occasion the individual, a martyr, or a conscientious objector, may have to decide for himself whether a law is unjust or not. Are we to deny a similar right to the Pope? But it was over the first point that Bellarmine came into collision with the first of the Stuarts, for King James, on the morrow of the Gunpowder Plot, had invited his Catholic subjects (racks, ropes, fines,

etc., in the back-ground) to subscribe to the following formula :

I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position that Princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever.

Now, though this oath did not deny the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction, it sorely offended the Court of Rome. And with excellent reason, for the implication of the whole measure was that the gunpowder men had derived their inspiration from official Catholic teaching. James himself said as much, while at the same time exonerating the English Catholic community as a whole from any blame for the Plot. Moreover, was it not a subtle form of tyranny to compel men to swear that they abhorred and detested as impious and heretical a theory that had formed part of the law of nations in the Middle Ages, and that had been acted on, with the consent of Christendom, by some of the saintliest of the Popes? Again, the word "abjure" means to renounce on oath, and a man cannot renounce an opinion that he never held. To ask the Catholics, then, to abjure the damnable doctrine that Princes deposed by the Pope might be murdered, was tantamount to asking them to swear that the Popes had taught such damnable doctrine, which, of course, they never did. Finally, the Oath was not a self-contained piece of legislation. It was an integral part of an abominable series of new penal statutes, passed "for the better discovery and repressing of Popish Recusants."

For these and other reasons Bellarmine's biographer felt himself justified in suggesting that, however inopportune the condemnation and prohibition of the Oath by Paul V. may have been, the Pope was still within his rights in issuing them, and that consequently Catholics ought not to have subscribed to the obnoxious formula. While not in the least implying that disobedience to the Pope was legitimate, Abbot Butler gives some telling arguments against the biographer's general conclusion :

We have to say [he writes] that we look on it as a regrettable oversight that Fr. Brodrick has not extended his range of vision so as to take count of the oaths proposed and taken two centuries later at the time of Catholic Emancipation, for they certainly throw back a flood of light on the earlier controversy. . . . Various forms of oath had been put for-

ward and pronounced inadmissible; at last in 1821 that great protagonist of Ultramontanism in England, Bishop Milner, drew up a form of oath which he thought could be taken by Catholics. For the words of 1606, "impious, heretical, damnable," he substituted "false and treasonable"; otherwise the passage stands exactly as in 1606. Moreover, what is remarkable, his oath went beyond that of 1606, saying: "And I declare that no foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath or ought to have any civil or temporal jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this Realm." This is an explicit repudiation of the "indirect" power. The Irish Bishops and the English Vicars Apostolic accepted this form of oath as one that might be taken by Catholics with a safe conscience. The Catholic Relief Bill of 1829 contained an oath to be taken by Catholic Members of either House of Parliament, by all Catholics who should vote at a Parliamentary Election, and by all holding an office of emolument, civil or military, under the Crown. It contained the following: "I do declare that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that Princes . . . etc. [as in 1606]. And I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, . . . etc." [as in Milner's oath]. As every phase and turn of the Emancipation movement was referred to Rome, it cannot be in doubt that this oath was at least tolerated as one permissible for Catholics to take; and thereby was tacitly given up the deposing power and the theory of indirect authority over temporals, as part of the Catholic system.

Before continuing this discussion it may be well to say that at the present time it is a purely theoretical one, as the oath of 1829 was erased from the Statute Book more than fifty years ago. Any Catholic is at liberty now to vote and become Home Secretary or a general in the Army, even though he holds that Pius XI. has power to depose any of the few remaining monarchs whom the war has left on their thrones. We may, then, argue the matter to our heart's content, because our consciences and our civic loyalties are no longer involved. English statesmanship has happily outgrown its earlier infantile obsessions about the malignant designs of Rome.

The question to be decided is whether the Oath of 1829, in which English Catholics declared their disbelief in the indirect

power of the Pope, may be considered as having finally consigned that theory to the lumber room of theology, there to keep company with such dusty and dilapidated curiosities as the Donation of Constantine, Geocentrism, the Dionysian authorship of the books that Dionysius did not write, etc. To begin with, there can be little doubt that the indirect power denied in the Oath was the indirect power as understood by Bellarmine. We have ample proof of this in the pamphlet literature of the period, and in the replies of foreign universities to questions addressed to them by English and Irish Catholics. The history of the oath proposed by Milner in 1821, to which Abbot Butler refers, is interesting in this respect. Milner, of course, was not its author, for all he did was to patch together those bits of earlier oaths which he considered to be unobjectionable.

The first Relief Act, for Irish Catholics, passed as far back as 1772, was a comical measure entitled "An Act to encourage the reclaiming of unprofitable Bogs." Up to that time the British Government had protected the unprofitable bogs from Papist shovels, but it was then enacted

by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in this present Parliament assembled, that every Papist or person professing the Popish religion, who shall be desirous to employ his industry and money for the improvement of the Kingdom by reclaiming of unprofitable bog, shall be at liberty to take a lease of any tract or quantity of such bog not exceeding fifty acres, plantation measure, . . . the laws made to prevent the growth of Popery to the contrary notwithstanding. (11 and 12 Geo. III., Chap. 21.)

He had to pay rent for his bit of bog, of course, but he was not obliged to detest, abhor or abjure anything before getting to work on it.

Shortly after the Bog Act, another one was passed, "to enable His Majesty's [Irish] subjects to testify their allegiance to him." This Act presented the Catholics with the first of the many Emancipation oaths. It contained the clause of King James's Oath, quoted above, and also a clause that must have made James turn in his grave, for the Catholics were called upon "utterly to renounce and abjure any obedience or allegiance unto the person who is said to have assumed the style and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland, by the name of Charles the Third." In this respect, at any rate,

Bellarmino's views on the Divine Right of Kings were properly vindicated by the Parliament of England, for the person styling himself Charles III. was the great-great-grandson of James I. This Oath of 1774 contains, too, the clause declaring disbelief in the indirect power of the Pope, which we find, word for word the same, in Milner's Oath of 1821. The greater part of the clause is from Henry VIII.'s Oath of Supremacy, and it would be interesting to know who first proposed the changes from "any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual," to "any civil or temporal jurisdiction, directly or indirectly." Whoever he was, he knew something about theological controversies.

A short time after the passage of the new Oath of Allegiance through Parliament, Fr. Arthur O'Leary, a Dublin Franciscan, came out with a resounding defence of it. In his tract, which is entitled, "Loyalty asserted : or a Vindication of the Oath of Allegiance," Bellarmine is utterly drowned in a torrent of eloquence :

On the banks of the Tyber a bigoted divine vests in the Pope an indirect power over wicked kings. . . . The doctrine of the Italian has fattened the German soil with dead bodies, and induced a Pope to attempt placing his flesh and blood on the throne of the Cæsars. . . . But the ultramontane divine *bristling* [italics O'Leary's] with barbarous Latin, is not read by one in three millions. Powdered with dust, and stretched on the shelf of a college library, he sleeps as sound as Endymion in his cave. . . . Must an Irish Catholic starve because an Italian wrote nonsense in bad Latin two hundred years ago?

O'Leary's tract so pleased the Irish Protestant House of Commons that they devoted some time to its author's praises, during the debates on February 26, 1782. Sir Lucius O'Brien, who said that he did not approve of religious orders, yet allowed that Fr. O'Leary and Clement XIV., the Pope who suppressed the Jesuits, were fine men. After this O'Leary became known as the "Irish Ganganelli," Ganganelli being Pope Clement's family name. "If I did not know him to be a Christian clergyman by his works," said Mr. Grattan, "I should suppose him to be a philosopher of the Augustan age."

The English Relief Act of 1778 contained an oath almost identical with that prescribed for the Irish Catholics in 1774. For some peculiar reason the Irishman was called upon to swear "in the presence of God, and of His only Son Jesus

Christ, my Redeemer," whereas the Englishman was asked to swear merely "in the presence of God." It looks as if suspicions had been entertained concerning the Irish Catholics' belief in the Redemption. In other respects, the two oaths were exactly the same. After the passage of the Bill, the body calling itself the Catholic Committee presented a petition to Parliament for further relief. In this they disavowed and repudiated the indirect power of the Pope in the strongest terms, and even assured the Government that they acknowledged no infallibility in the Pope. In 1788 the same men waited on Mr. Pitt to learn his views with regard to their petition. Pitt requested them to obtain for him the opinions of Catholic universities abroad "on the existence and extent of the Pope's dispensing power." They accordingly framed three questions and sent them to Louvain, Douay, Paris, Valladolid, Alcala and Salamanca. The first question was, "Whether any follower of the Church of Rome, or any assembly of men, or the Cardinals, or even the Pope, hath or have, in civil matters, any authority, jurisdiction, power or pre-eminence within the limits of the Kingdom of England?" The answer of Louvain was a very long-winded, strongly-worded negative, in which Bellarmine, as usual, played the role of villain. Douay replied more mildly but to the same effect. The answer of the Sorbonne is interesting enough to deserve a paragraph to itself.

The Sorbonne doctors obviously enjoyed themselves. They begin with greetings to all their readers, and then proceed to tell how in 1626 their predecessors had censured the thesis of Santarelli that "the Pope has at least indirectly a power over princes in temporals" as being "new, false, erroneous, contrary to the word of God, bringing odium on the Papal dignity, giving occasion to schism, derogatory to the sovereign authority of kings, tending to subvert kingdoms, states and republics, to excite subjects to faction," etc., etc. Next, Mr. Pitt is informed that a candidate for the degree of bachelor, by name Malagola, had been struck off the list in 1682 because he maintained the same thesis.

Of the uniformity of our doctrine upon this head [the writers continue] the celebrated declaration of the French clergy, published in 1682, will be an eternal monument; and it well expresses the genuine sentiments of the Faculty. . . . Ever since the year 1682, it has been the will of the Sacred Faculty of Paris that this doctrine [the Gallican

articles] should, in the very words of the declaration, be taught in her schools; and it is a law and uninterrupted usage of the Faculty that all the bachelors, before they take their degree of licentiates, should maintain it in their public theses.

Continuing, after much more in the same strain, the doctors refer to "that learned work of Bossuet, 'Defensio Cleri Gallicani,' " as a prime authority. On the deposing power these are their sentiments: "The doctrine of the right of the Popes to depose princes excommunicated, is heretical, *materialiter*, that is, contrary to the very Word of God."

The other three universities, Valladolid, Alcala and Salamanca, need not detain us long. They denied the indirect power, but Valladolid was candid enough to let it be known that "all the universities in the Spanish dominions are commanded by royal authority to maintain this view."

From these answers of learned academical bodies, it might seem that Bellarmine's theory was indeed dead and buried at the end of the eighteenth century. But before deciding that this was so, a cautious student might care to investigate the credentials of the doctors. He might ask himself whether the years when the answers were given were not the hey-day of Febronianism and Josephism in the Austrian dominions. Louvain was in those dominions, and he would want to know whether, in addition to its sympathies with the Jansenists, which were well known, the University had not received a further inducement to anti-Papal sentiment, in the shape of threats and commands from the civil authorities. Douay, Paris, Valladolid, Alcala, and Salamanca were all under Bourbon jurisdiction, and Bourbon policy in its dealings with the Holy See is no secret to any student of history. Paris, indeed, let the cat out of the bag by its pious appeal to the Four Articles, which had already been censured and rejected by two Popes, and were, a few years after the Sorbonne's answer, to be reprobated once again by Pius VI. in his Bull *Auctorem Fidei*, condemning the Synod of Pistoia. Whichever we look at this sad period of the Church's history we observe the blight of Gallicanism spoiling the bloom of men's faith. It was the sombre presage of the Revolution that was to enthrone a prostitute as Goddess of Reason on the altar of Notre Dame. Even Ireland did not escape. During the Penal Days and up to the foundation of Maynooth in 1795 her priests were educated abroad at just such centres as

Louvain, Douay, Paris, Valladolid, etc. Naturally, they imbibed the doctrines fashionable in those places, doctrines not entirely derived from the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. It was argued by Mgr. Neville in the *Dublin Review* (October, 1879), that Maynooth itself became "a hotbed of Gallicanism, the Gallicanism of the Sorbonne, the Gallicanism of the *Clerus Gallicanus*." The late Archbishop Walsh, who was then vice-president of Maynooth, protested strongly against Mgr. Neville's allegations and published a refutation of them. But Archbishop Croke of Cashel thought that the weight of evidence was against Dr. Walsh, while his friendly and most competent biographer and namesake, Mgr. Patrick Walsh, thinks that he overstated his case, and is not convincing in his endeavours to acquit the French professors at Maynooth of Gallican leanings.<sup>1</sup>

Turning next to England, it is well known that immediately after their petition to Pitt in 1788 the Catholic Committee adopted a "Protestation" of their religious views which contained a fervent denial of the indirect power of the Pope, coupled with an entire rejection of his infallibility. This document, of which the Protestant Lord Stanhope was author, was accepted and signed by all four Vicars Apostolic, and by 240 priests, including John Milner himself. True, the infallibility denied need not necessarily be construed as the infallibility that is now an article of faith, but the fact that the Catholic leaders gave their signatures to such an ambiguous formula points to some confusion in their theology and practical programme. A new oath was subsequently drawn up on the lines of the Protestation. As first proposed by the Catholic Committee it described the doctrine of the deposing power as "impious and heretical," and continued :

I do solemnly swear . . . that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate, hath or ought to have any civil jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within this Realm, or any spiritual authority, power or jurisdiction whatsoever within this Realm, that can, directly or indirectly, affect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws or constitution of this Kingdom, or with the civil or ecclesiastical government thereof, as by law established. . . . And I do also in my conscience declare and solemnly swear that I acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope. . . .

<sup>1</sup> William J. Walsh, *Archbishop of Dublin*. London, Longmans, p. 92, 1928.

This schismatical formula was, of course, rejected by the Vicars Apostolic, but the mere fact that it could have been proposed by Catholics at all is sufficient proof of the prevalence of Gallican tendencies in England. The men who championed it, even after its condemnation by their ecclesiastical leaders, were the loudest in their approval of the Oath of King James I. That Oath was their model, as may be seen from their return to James's own terms "impious and heretical," applied to the doctrine of the deposing power. Might it not be argued that this Oath of 1789-1790 is, almost by itself, a justification of Paul V.'s censure of the earlier one? By their fruits ye shall know them, and the apple of discord cherished by the Cisalpine Club was certainly grown on the tree which James I. planted.

As Bishop Milner's name was mentioned by Abbot Butler, we may inquire whether the opposition of that valiant champion of Catholic rights to Bellarmine's theory of the indirect power is a good argument against its validity. In a debate in the English House of Commons on May 11, 1813, Canning opposed Milner's authority to that of Bellarmine. Both men were "equally celebrated," he said, and, instead of "the interminable horizon of getting Bellarmine by heart," he suggested that Milner was "the only person necessary to examine." This was to make the Bishop a Doctor of the Church with a vengeance! A little earlier in the same day's debate, Sir J. C. Hippisley eulogized Milner in similar terms, remarking that "were the House to allow them to go into Committee, he would prove that even Dr. Milner was formerly jealous of the interference of the Roman See." That was evidently one of the reasons for their approval of him. It was quite a true reason, too, for, as we have seen, Milner had signed the Cisalpine Protestation, acknowledging "no infallibility in the Pope." At one time he had been strongly in favour of the Veto, *i.e.*, of conceding to the Government a right to bar the election to Catholic bishoprics of men whose political views were not to its fancy, and as late as 1821 he proposed an oath which contained the sentence: "I also declare that it is not an article of the Roman Catholic Faith, and that I am not thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible." This oath was approved by the four Archbishops and six other Bishops of Ireland on June 26, 1821.<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking, of course, there was nothing illegitimate

<sup>1</sup> Ward: "The Eve of Catholic Emancipation," Vol. III, p. 359.

in that declaration, but one may ask whether any bishop would to-day approve an oath declaring that "it is not an article of the Roman Catholic faith, and that I am not thereby required to believe that the Blessed Virgin Mary was assumed into Heaven."? Outside the spheres of Gallican influence the infallibility of the Pope was as strongly maintained in those days as the Assumption of Our Lady is everywhere maintained to-day. That Milner and the Irish Bishops should have been willing to sanction even a faint repudiation of it is at least an indication that their denial of the indirect power may not safely be taken as sounding the death-knell of that theory.

To sum up the question of the oaths, then, the argument of these pages, for what it is worth, is that during the Emancipation period in both England and Ireland there were influences at work to hinder a due appreciation of all that might have been said in favour of the Pope's indirect power in temporal matters. Gallicanism was undoubtedly in the air, and political pressure, constantly applied, succeeded in distilling from it the definite rejection of the indirect power in the Bill of 1829. It would ill-become us who have been born in the Promised Land to cast aspersions on those who had to struggle to it through such a wilderness of bigotry and oppression. Whatever mistakes they made were not deliberate and conscious deviations from the broad tradition of the Church, and the only thing really to be regretted about their concessions to Protestant prejudice is their proven futility. The published correspondence of Peel and Wellington show clearly that the English Government yielded, not as a reward for such concessions, but because it was frightened by the tremendous influence of Daniel O'Connell. Even Catholic Emancipation, as Wellington admitted, was a lesser evil than civil war.

So far the argument of this article has been negative. We have endeavoured to prove that the denial of the indirect power in the Emancipation Act of 1829 need not necessarily be taken as evidence that Bellarmine's theory has been superseded. In conclusion the reader may care to see some of many positive indications that it is still flourishing in Catholic theology. Cardinal Litta, the Prefect of Propaganda with whom the Vicars Apostolic at the time of Emancipation were so frequently in correspondence, was himself a fervent disciple of Bellarmine in the matter. This may be seen by reading the eighth letter of his *Lettres sur les quatre articles*.

Thirteen years after the passage of the Bill, Professor George Phillips of Innsbruck wrote an elaborate defence of the theory, which is still referred to as authoritative in questions of canon law. In his letter, *Ad Apostolicae Sedis*, of August 22, 1851, Pope Pius IX. censured the proposition that "the Church has no right to employ force, and possesses no temporal power direct or indirect." This proposition forms No. 24 of the *Syllabus*. Lucien Choupin, a cautious writer who is a doctor of both theology and canon law, commits himself to the following statement in his commentary on the *Syllabus*: "D'après la Bulle *Unam Sanctam* . . . la doctrine du pouvoir indirect est *théologiquement certaine*."<sup>1</sup> In his context he makes it perfectly plain that he is speaking of the indirect power in Bellarmine's sense. Mgr. d'Hulst, in the notes to his *Notre Dame* conferences of 1895, is equally emphatic. He rejects all other systems, such as Fénelon's and Gosselin's, as inadequate or erroneous, and gives his complete adherence to the system of Bellarmine.<sup>2</sup> Turning to the well-known and highly-esteemed *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique* (fascicule xix, Paris, 1923, cols. 107, 115) we read the following sober paragraphs :

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the rights of freeing subjects from their oath of allegiance and of deposing sovereigns have lost, as Papal prerogatives, much of their practical importance, once so ardently debated, and now wear a look of extreme archaism. Nevertheless, the doctrinal principle involved finds new applications adapted to the social and political conditions of our own day. . . . The theory [of the indirect power] has become simpler, clearer, more free of adventitious elements. But it remains, in substance, the same theory that was, so to speak, latent in the Pontifical teaching of the Middle Ages; that found exact formulation in the time of Bellarmine and Suarez, when those two great theologians determined its precise content in their controversy with James I. . . . So determined and understood, it would appear a proximate and certain consequence of the universal and plenary spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope that Catholic dogma proposes for our belief.

Finally, the reader may have patience to listen to the opinion of perhaps the greatest modern authority on canon

<sup>1</sup> "Valeur des Décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège," Paris, 1907, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> "Conférences de Notre-Dame: La Morale du citoyen," Paris, 1912, pp. 374, sqq.

law. After fifteen years' tenure of the professorial chair in this subject at the Gregorian University, Francis Xavier Wernz, S.J., published the first volume of his masterly work, *Jus Decretalium*, in 1905. As every student of theology knows, this work is now a standard authority in the schools, and has been honoured with the special approbation of the Holy See. Here, then, is the opinion of Wernz on the subject we are discussing :

It is abundantly clear that, with the exception of a few champions of extremer views, the doctrine of the indirect power of the Church was commonly propounded as beyond all doubt by Catholic theologians and canonists, both before and after the Reformation. This was the view, for instance, of St. Thomas, Victoria, Molina, Soto, Stapleton, Bianchi, Mamachi, Petra, Gengler and Phillips. Suarez stated that it was "the common and certain conclusion of Catholics." After the promulgation of the *Syllabus* by Pius IX., the same view was likewise rightly defended as certain by Liberatore, Tarquini, Palmieri, Manning, Molitor, Bargilliat, Hammerstein, Perez, Biederlack, and many others. Those Catholic writers are consequently in error who treat the theory of the indirect power of the Church as merely a free opinion, more or less probable, or who, from certain motives of prudence, put it aside, that neglecting truly fundamental principles, they may explain the relation of Church and State by concordats or "historical evolution." Again, those are mistaken who urge against the theory such invalid arguments as its impracticability, at least in our own age. For the truth of a doctrine and the rights of the Church are not conditioned by time, or the difficulty of putting them in practice. Were this the case, we should have to deny other rights of the Church which are beyond all question. Besides, it is false to say that the theory of the indirect power is incapable of being put to practical use at the present day, for if at the present day certain civil laws should be declared invalid by the Church, then these laws would actually be devoid of all binding force.<sup>1</sup>

Not many months after the publication of these words, they were strikingly confirmed by the encyclical *Vehementer*, February 11, 1906, in which Pope Pius X. declared by his supreme authority that the law separating Church and State, passed by the French Government on December 9, 1905, was

<sup>1</sup> *Jus Decretalium*, t. I, p. 19.

null and void and without any juridical value. The Pope, it must be noted, did not merely condemn the injustice of the law. He invalidated the law itself, and his action is utterly inexplicable and unjustifiable on any theory except that of the indirect power as defended by Blessed Robert Bellarmine. Fénelon, Gosselin, Bishop Milner and all the other deniers of the indirect power *in sensu Bellarmino* would have found the *Vehementer* a very awkward piece of furniture indeed to fit within the narrow limits of Papal prerogative as they conceived it.

Not even their warmest admirers would claim for Milner and the other English and Irish Bishops of the Emancipation period the competence in theology and canon law that Bellarmine, Suarez and Wernz possessed. The Bishops were splendid men, but they were not splendid theologians, a fact, considering the times and circumstances of their labours, for which no one could possibly blame them. If it be argued that Rome must have seen and at least tolerated the Oath of 1829, it may be answered that temporary toleration does not spell permanent approval. Besides, no evidence has been produced that the question of the indirect power was submitted to the judgment of the Holy See at the time of Emancipation. It was submitted to Louvain, Valladolid, etc., but, then, Louvain and Valladolid were never recognized by the Catholic Church as the arbiters of her theological controversies. Had they been, the opinions of Baius and Jansenius, both Louvain men, would to-day be held in high esteem. Speaking about the Oath in a letter from Rome to John Lingard, May 9, 1827, Dr. Gradwell said : "I have all the letters of Barberini . . . . about the oaths in the time of Charles I. and the negotiations on this matter. Rome always stuck to the briefs of Paul V. and Bellarmine : and would never approve, but only tolerate, the Oath which English Catholics take at present."<sup>3</sup>

A few words on the deposing power and we have done. In the life of Bellarmine it is stated that "were he writing at the present day he would not insist on the deposing power." Criticizing this, Abbot Butler writes : "But surely Bellarmine minus the deposing power would not be Bellarmine at all : it is the logical outcome and crown of the whole theory [of the indirect power], and was held by him as proximately Catholic

<sup>3</sup> These lines of Gradwell have not been published before. Only part of the letter is given in Haile and Bonney's *Lingard*, p. 224.

Faith." That is perfectly true, but what is stated in the book is not that Bellarmine, were he writing at the present day, would *deny* to the Popes an inherent and radical right to depose civil rulers when their misgovernment tended to the ruin of souls, but only that he would not *insist* on such a right. *In radice*, he would say, the Popes still possess that right, but as rights and duties are co-relative a right cannot be exercised when the duties it entails are no longer recognized. In other words, the right is in abeyance, but it would revive if social conditions changed, if rulers were, once more, absolute monarchs, and if the nations became genuinely Catholic again. It is significant of changed conditions that Rome does not contemplate declaring President Calles deposed, though few would deny that the deposing power so exercised would benefit mankind. Understood in this way, hedged about with all reasonable safeguards and conditions, the prerogative, as a theory, is but a logical deduction from a Christian reading of history. "This power," wrote Cardinal Newman, "most rarely exercised, and on very extraordinary occasions, it is not necessary for any Catholic to acknowledge; and I suppose, comparatively speaking, few Catholics do acknowledge it; to be honest, I must say, I do."<sup>1</sup>

Newman wrote those words as a comment on the well-known Allocution of Pius IX. to a Roman *Academia*, July 20, 1871 (quoted in the Life of Bellarmine, Vol. I., p. 268). The Pope's address has often been interpreted by Catholic writers as a definite and final abandonment of the doctrine of the deposing power, so ardently maintained by a number of his predecessors. But this interpretation is not correct. Pope Pius spoke of the doctrine as a Papal *right* and nowhere suggested that, under special circumstances and in a special order of society, it ever was or would be anything else but a right. What he denied was that this right *had anything to do with the question of infallibility*, as some antagonists of that doctrine had endeavoured to maintain.

JAMES BRODRICK.

<sup>1</sup> "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," 4th ed., p. 40.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### THE "TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT" ON EMANCIPATION MATTERS.

LIKE the delightful new animal called a "Tigger" which Mr. A. A. Milne has recently presented to the nurseries of the Empire, the *Times Literary Supplement* is sometimes "very bouncy." Now and then, it takes surprising leaps into the vast inane, and for some reason it has a preference for Catholic books as a springboard. Major Hay's "Chain of Error in Scottish History" has been declared by more than one eminent non-Catholic authority a work deserving of serious attention and careful review, but the *Times Literary Supplement* treated it as a petulant child treats some object of its disdain. It metaphorically tossed its head and stuck out its tongue. In its issue of December 6, 1928, there appeared a review of Mr. Gwynn's excellent book, "The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation." Mr. Gwynn has criticized severely—and rightly—the sentence, "we acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope," which the Catholic Committee wished to include in the oath proposed by them in 1788. Tut-tut, Mr. Gwynn, says the reviewer, the Committee were quite justified because "in 1788 the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not generally accepted, even as a pious opinion, in most Catholic countries." His proof of this sweeping statement is a vague generalization about the prevalence of Gallicanism and Febronianism at the date mentioned. Let us see whether there is anything in it, or whether the reviewer is not just being "very bouncy."

First, the statement needs this serious qualification that, even in France its native land, Gallicanism was largely confined to academic circles which were under Court control. The politicians and *parlements* were Gallican, truly enough, and they saw to it that the ecclesiastics who depended on them for advancement held their own views. But this is no proof that the majority of the French clergy or even a small minority of ordinary French Catholics were Gallicans. Arianism was once the fashion in Court circles, but no one would argue from that fact that the generality of fourth century Catholics were Arians. Writing about this very point in 1724, in his "Traité de l'Infallibilité du Pape," the Benedictine Abbot, Matthew Petit-Didier said: "When it is asserted that the doctrine of Papal *fallibility* in matters of faith is the opinion of France, at least one half of the assertion ought to be retrenched. For a very considerable num-

ber of bishops and doctors, even of Paris, of religious, of pastors and churchmen of every rank is found throughout the Kingdom, who hold the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs and their authority and pre-eminence over Councils to be undoubted truths." If that was the state of affairs in 1724 can we believe that the "undoubted truths" had turned into something less even than "pious opinions" by 1788? Church history affords no parallel to such a revolution, and not a trace of evidence that this one took place. Indeed, any evidence there is points to a revolution of just the opposite kind.

In the space at my disposal I can do little more than refer to the titles and dates of a few representative theological treatises of the eighteenth century. Even these few, however, chosen more or less at random, will do to bring the *Literary Supplement* reviewer back to earth. To begin, there is a treatise published by the German, Vitus Pichler, at Augsburg in 1709. This is a literal rendering of the Latin title: "The Papacy never erring in propounding articles of faith; that is, the Roman Pontiff proposed in public disputation as the Vicar on earth of Jesus Christ, the Successor of St. Peter, the Pastor and Ruler of the Universal Church, and the Judge of controversies pertaining to faith and morals, supreme in authority and power, and infallible in decision." Next, we have a work published in 1720 by a native of Cyprus, Count Louis Andruzzi. Its title is: "The universal and uninterrupted teaching of the Church on the infallibility of the Pope in deciding *ex cathedra* questions of faith, independently of an ecumenical council and prior to acceptance by the faithful." Both of these writers are as "ultramontane" as Cardinal Manning. In 1736 appeared an interesting riposte entitled: "An 'antithesis' against H. Serry who strives to confine the Papal infallibility within certain limits." Serry, a French Dominican, certainly believed in the Pope's personal infallibility, but he endeavoured to whittle it down too much. His book was put on the Index, and a brother Dominican, Father Maria Lucini, wrote the above mentioned treatise against him. Three years later, 1739, Francis Orsi's great work, "De irreformabili Romani Pontificis in definiendis controversiis judicio," appeared at Rome. It was written directly as a refutation of the Fourth Gallican Article, and constitutes a perfect armoury of solid arguments from tradition, for the personal infallibility of the Pope. It enjoyed immense influence, and makes the "pious opinion" idea of infallibility look like a sorry joke. Proceeding we come to another famous work, entirely devoted to establishing the primacy and personal infallibility of the Pope. This is Pietro Balcerini's classic treatise, "De vi ac ratione Primatus Romanorum Pontificum," published at Verona in 1766. The following year saw the publication of Francesco Zaccaria's crushing refutation

of Hontheim, alias Febronius. So learned was Zaccaria that in 1754 he had been chosen to succeed the great Muratori as librarian and archivist to the Duke of Modena. Modena was then a fief of the Empire and its Dukes were under the thumb of Joseph II. In such circumstances, it was very brave of Zaccaria to publish his "Antifebronio," a powerful defence of the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope. Of course it meant the loss of his position at Modena, a further illustration of the methods by which Gallicanism and Febronianism were propagated.

In 1768 the Dominican Provincial of French Flanders, Charles René Billuart, issued his well-known commentary on St. Thomas. Therein, in defiance of parliaments and kings, he asserted and proved *per longum et latum* that "the judgment of the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals is infallible independently of the consent of the Church" ("Tractatus de Fide," Diss. iv., art 3). This he called "the common opinion of all Catholic nations except France," and nobody ventured to contradict him. At Ratisbonne or Regensburg Professor Charles Sardagna maintained a similar thesis in his lectures, and devoted more than fifty pages to its defence in his "Theologia Dogmatico-polemica," published in 1769. It is interesting to note that this fine work was re-issued at York, England, in 1818, by T. Wilson and Sons, and received a warm welcome from the English Catholic clergy. That these priests did not regard the infallibility of the Pope as a mere pious opinion is further shown by the Rev. Charles Plowden's "Considerations on the *modern* opinion of the fallibility of the Pope," published in Paternoster Row in 1790. This eloquent and convincing tract was occasioned by the phrase "we acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope," which inspired the *Times Literary Supplement* reviewer to play at omniscience. I suppose he never heard of the Rev. Charles Plowden and I am certain he never heard of the Rev. Peter Dens, Doctor of Louvain University and Rector of the ecclesiastical seminary of Malines. Nevertheless, Peter Dens was an important person and had influence with the English as well as the Belgian Catholics. In the very year of Catholic Emancipation, 1829, Dens propounded and defended this thesis in his treatise "De Ecclesia": "The Supreme Pontiff, when defining *ex cathedra* matters pertaining to faith and morals, is infallible by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost."

The reader has now probably had more than enough, though we have omitted some of the most important eighteenth century witnesses, such as Cardinal Gotti and John Berti. We were told that in *most* Catholic countries infallibility was not held even as a *pious opinion*, and we have seen that in Germany, Austria, Luxembourg, Belgium, Italy and France itself it was

held by eminent and widely-influential Dominicans, Benedictines, Jesuits, secular priests, learned laymen, and others as a solidly-established, undoubted truth of revelation. If England and Ireland did not join so lustily in the chorus that was partly because of their isolated position and partly because they had a touch of the Gallican fog in their throats, as well as the British Government, *metaphorice loquendo*, at their throats.

The reviewer's further remark that "the English Roman Catholics with rare exceptions, held a hundred years ago much the same tenets as the more moderate Anglo-Catholics of to-day," is too silly to need detailed refutation. One can imagine what Charles Butler or any other "Cisalpine" would have retorted. What John Milner would have said could not, perhaps, be put in print. The English Catholics a hundred years ago patiently suffered social and civic ostracism precisely because they did *not* and would *not* accept the fundamental tenet of the more moderate Anglo-Catholics of to-day. They stuck to the Pope through thick and thin, while, though nobody knows exactly what the more moderate Anglo-Catholics stick to, it certainly is not the Pope. That is the real dividing line, a fine, big, unmistakable, unbroken line running through English history from the days of Elizabeth. The reviewer's inability to see it shows that there is something wrong with his theological spectacles.

J. BRODRICK.

---

EXTENDED POWERS OF THE GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY.

THE Gregorian University, that worthy daughter of the old Roman College, the seed-ground of Saints and Doctors, and an intellectual centre in the Holy City, has, from its inception, been under the immediate patronage of the Popes; and every fresh stage in its advancement marks the inherent satisfaction which the Holy Father feels in the progress made in the conduct of its Higher Studies.

The most recent manifestation of this fatherly interest has been the affiliation to the Gregorian of two highly specialized courses of ecclesiastical learning, connected, on the one hand, with Holy Scripture, and on the other, with the Oriental Church. Needless to say, these studies have never been neglected at the University; and in 1908 Pius X. had approved of a specialized Higher School in such Faculties. But the work was too vast, and involved so many additions to the existing teaching body that in 1910 the same Pope set up in the Piazza della Pilotta, the Pontifical Biblical Institute, under the immediate control of the Society of Jesus, that the matter might be dealt with radically. Two years ago, thanks to the energy and discretion of the Rector, Fr. J. O'Rourke,

S.J., a branch house was opened in Jerusalem to enable students to examine their problems *in situ*.

Next, there was that further problem, both old and new, of the Unity of the Eastern Churches, which called for great technical skill in the handling. For this it became necessary that an Institute of Oriental Studies should be founded, competent to deal with all such matters. It owes its origin to a Motu Proprio of 1917, and another of 1922, when the personal management was handed over to a body of Jesuit professors, with Bishop d'Herbigny at their head.

Just as it was in the life-time of Cardinal Bellarmine, when a Chair of Catholic Controversy was the means of setting the true tone in the theological difficulties of the hour, the Gregorian University was empowered to erect this Chair with the Cardinal as its foremost protagonist, so, now that the centre of controversy has shifted to the ground of Biblical erudition and the subtleties of the Oriental problem, this same University has been enabled by the Vicar of Christ to deal with them in the same convincing way. By affiliating to it the two Faculties above mentioned, a means has been found of providing for the Catholic Priesthood opportunities to acquire the high level of scholarship necessary for the fulfilment of its work. Those who are conversant with the problem will at once realize the importance of the step; a better co-ordination in the drafting of courses, the opportunity for freer exchange of ideas amongst the professors themselves and an effective linking up of three great libraries, are only the more obvious of its advantages.

The Holy Father has confirmed all powers previously granted to these Institutes for conferring Academical Degrees, and he reiterates his desire that whenever possible the local Ordinaries and Superiors General should endeavour to give their subjects the advantages gained from these Courses.

One important section of Biblical research, however, has been left by this decree precisely where it was. Many years ago the Holy See entrusted the Benedictine Order with the revision of the text of the Vulgate, by the formation of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. With Cardinal Gasquet as its head, the gigantic work is making progress, of which even the student portion of the Church is little aware. All this will continue as before, and as something particularly in accord with the traditions of that great Order, until it is in the happy position of laying at the feet of the then reigning Pontiff the text of the Vulgate as it issued from the pen of St. Jerome.

E. K.

## YOUTH: AND THE KING OF TRUTH.

I BELIEVE that it would further the cause of Christ our King if, into the whole body of non-Catholic Education, there could be injected the spirit of true scientific scepticism.

With all the "progress" that has been made in the manner of school-teaching the young, by the methods of Froebel, Montessori, etc., right up to the specialized vocational training for those of leaving-school age, nobody has thought of teaching them to *doubt*. Oh, they have their doubts, those boys and girls, but they are the wrong doubts,—amateur, uneducated doubts. One of the trailing clouds of glory which early fades into the light of a common school day is that infant inclination for the Socratic "Why?" A young child is naturally dubious, especially about things which seem to him confused, contradictory or unjust. He has a genius for the ultimate. But unless this is guided and enlightened, it is presently led astray and lost in his loyalties, as he grows to the clannish age and becomes a mere partisan, upholding through affection the opinions of Father or an admired form-master. "The child with great candour of eyes" becomes the boy who only cares that he and his side should win in any match, whether of cricket or ideas. Your truth-lover is lost, for the time being.

There are no worse offenders in the blending of white truth with grey opinions than the editors of modern books for children about the universe. There, in monthly parts, are published stale fiction about the Piltdown skull, Galileo, and a Methodist, vegetarian St. Francis; pappy dilutions of the Gospels, called unsectarian because they are constructed without a bone of theology to give them substance and shape, and so on, cheek by jowl, with excellent explanations of geology, electricity, and so forth; with the result that the average child believes the whole publication to contain facts of equal reliability.

To counteract this mind-numbing process, no education could lay a better foundation for success in this world and salvation in the next, than the encouraging of those candid eyes of the seven-year-old to distinguish between what is true, what is reasonably probable, and what is a private opinion. We Catholics come into contact with many children to whom we are not able to teach the Catholic Faith: but there is nothing to prevent us teaching them *to think*. The Catholic aunt of non-Catholic nieces and nephews cannot share her theology with them, but, far from objecting, their parents will probably be pleased if she shows them how to use their reason. And a very small child can distinguish between graded statements. "Yes, it is true that Daddy has gone to Birmingham. Possibly St. Paul did visit England: there are reasons for thinking so. John the gardener thinks there's buried

treasure under the oak-tree, but Uncle says it's nonsense." There is a clear scale of facts and opinions. As for the higher reaches of imagination, why defraud a child of fairies? A child plays with its imagination as naturally as a kitten plays with its tail. God made this world, and God gave children the power to make a play-world of their own, just as Daddy, who has a real house, gave us a doll's house. The child needs no help in distinguishing between the fact that baby fell downstairs and the sad fall of Owl's house in Christopher-Robin's wood. "True in the story" or "True to me" are appreciated as alternatives for "really true."

Yet, armed with this kindergarten scale of values in reality, this ability to call facts, opinions and fancies by their right names, a child can cut his way through a good deal of undergrowth to the Kingdom of Truth. When he discovers that grown-up people treat opinions as facts, he will argue, and will either remain unsatisfied or, if he is speciously convinced, he will soon find his mistake, and will be the readier to mistrust persons he has found unreliable; because a child dislikes intensely to be confused or hindered in his reasoning. On the other hand, nothing gives him greater satisfaction than corroborative evidence. The simplest trick of science—the tumbler that, if pressed to his hand after a lighted match has been dropped in, is said to be able to stick to it, and *does*—rouses a kind of radiant pleasure. The reverse, of course, is true; that incalculable harm can come from failing a child. Of the two, to tell him that it is safe to tread on a plank that proves to be rotten, is less harmful than to fail him psychologically. His earliest loves will be those people who reassure him and give him a sense of security,—cook because she always moves in a realm of warmth and goodies, a shop-keeper who always has a smile ready, and so on up to that final refuge, his mother. One may believe that the instinctive love of God which is usual in a happy child, comes from his little, interior, inexplicable experiences of a Being Who, even when He is not understandable in His actions and permissions, never somehow *fails*. The core of his small heart tells him that God is the Truth—always.

Let us suppose that, at adolescence, your truth-lover is not *lost* in his loyalties, but saved for clear-sighted objectiveness of outlook. In children of this kind that I have known, this power to criticize has resulted as a reaction from the wrong kind of education. If a child's eyes are no less severe than they are candid, if the young are critical, then youth is only childhood equipped with better tools. Should any country become absurd unawares, it is not the Members of Parliament, the men of learning and letters, or even the poets, who will see what has happened, for all these are men of the age; it is the younger generation who will see, with intense annoyance and resentment, that their Father-land or Mother-country is making a fool of itself. What elder men

and women have grown accustomed to, the boys and girls see suddenly as they come out of the school-room; and it is those candid and severe critics who can give the pompous self-made Time-Spirit a tremor of doubt as to whether it could possibly not be quite so impressive and progressive as it had always thought itself. The school-boy, who does not fail to notice the least sign of dowdiness in his mother's dress or any short-coming in his father's hat, when they come to judgment at the Eton and Harrow match, might become the saviour of his country if he is not less acutely perceptive when he takes his place in the business of the world. When school is behind him, and he sees the task of leadership assigned by the Press to men like Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge, Lord Birkenhead and Lord Rothermere, Messrs. Wells, Bennett and Shaw, Augustus John and Nevinson, Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Arthur Keith, if only he has not forgotten how to think, if only he will continue to care about his country as he cared about his people and his school, the question will come into his mind as to whether these men are really representative, and, if so, what is the truth about England to-day?

This is an age when nearly everyone in the world of art, letters, trade or sport is prepared to turn amateur theologian at a moment's notice from Fleet Street. Is Chesterton the only man with eyes child-like enough to see the absurdity of it all—absurdity beyond the tribute of laughter?

One enthusiast doesn't make an Easter, but it would appear that, while certain scientists are disposing of hell, and some non-Catholic clergy are turning their churches into lecture-halls, concert rooms, cinemas, and theatres in the endeavour to attract larger congregations to hear an ever-decreasing Gospel, the younger generation is beginning to see what is dead and whence they may look for a reaction or a resurrection.

It is said that the reason why so many young men and women are becoming Catholics, is that they are the victims of the rebound from the materialism of the last century. I agree that the impetus is of the nature of a rebound, not from materialism, but from *sloppy thinking*. I do not imagine that they read St. Justin Martyr in the Underground, or that they sit up at night over the *Summa*, much as they may talk about it, but at least they know that, in the Catholic Church, no cleric starts out by signing the Thirty-Nine Articles, which he instantly proceeds to exp...n away. In the Catholic Church, the subjects of the Resurrection and the Judgment to come are not gingerly avoided, nor is the "Origin of Species" regarded as a superior edition of the Book of Genesis. In the Catholic Church, there is no desperate hurry to be up-to-date, no urgent need to be progressive, any more than the children playing in the market-place are making efforts to appear young.

Youth, which can afford to sit facing the light, likes other

people and philosophies to do the same thing. It respects anything that is definite. An ordinary boy who comes into contact with a priest will notice and respect at least three things about him : that he is business-like about his chosen profession and does not try to be a layman as well : that he can give a reason for all he does which is in harmony with his premisses, and that whatever be his attainments in secular learning, he is a priest as well as a scientist or literary man and not a scientific or literary cleric.

Accordingly, it works, this Catholicism ; it is straightforward and clear : super-natural but never un-natural ; rising far above reason, but never unreasonable. This alone is a great attraction to the young, who, too often, have suffered much from dogmatic unreasonableness at the hands of their elders in the nursery and schoolroom.

Youth has an infinite capacity for respect, and suffers, quite often, I think, from a sort of complex due to the repression of this demand, not being able to find enough people to respect. As for the past, which of Carlyle's "Heroes" have survived the judgment of history ? How flawed and stained are those figures of greatness seen to be whom national pride has tried to canonize. And our present sceptical days are not prolific of inspiring models. The peoples are perishing for want of "vision," and can we wonder that the boy with enthusiasms is in danger of having these priceless possessions thrust back upon him, and of becoming a disgruntled egotist ?

Enthusiasm is fostered abroad, notably in Italy, by the apotheosis of the Fatherland. But nations, like individuals, need ideals outside themselves, if there is to be a genuine and permanent elevation of character. When England had the Old Faith, men lived and died for it. When it was "Our Lady's Dowry," temporal achievements might be reckoned as the triumphs of a crusade, an extending and enriching of God's Kingdom. But Henry the Eighth deposed a more important Queen than Catherine of Aragon, and stole a greater dowry than that of any nun. In default of her, Protestant England was fain to idealize the sorry character of Elizabeth, and doughty deeds were accomplished for her sake. What might happen to-day if that Other Queen appeared to claim Her Dowry and her gallants ?

"Righteousness exalteth a nation." Can our country achieve true greatness till it knows the truth and follows it ? Can any Government lead it to prosperity which is not in effect the vice-gerent of Humanity's King ?

A year ago, the Lordship of Christ, proclaimed in Gabriel's announcement, was proclaimed anew by Rome. There has been no more significant action of the Holy See in latter times, than this. It is the answer of Christ's Church to the challenge of

Bolshevism which denies all sovereignty, divine and human alike.

Herein lies our hope, and that of all other nations. The youth of England can be rallied by that King Who is also the Truth, Whose Law enlightens. Nothing less will satisfy that capacity for respect which has been so starved, or will call forth the enthusiasm and loyalty which they have to give. No one who remembers the years of the War can doubt that our people know how to spend their lives, if there is anything worth spending them for. But someone has first to rally them by showing where is truth. If but such a *reveillé* could be sounded, as it were on the antique horn of Glastonbury's Arthur, we should have no need to despair of emulating in a new England the glories of her ancient Faith.

C. R. H.

---

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**The King's  
Illness.**

One hesitates in this place, when the issues of a day may make one's hopes inapplicable to fact, to speak of the King's illness at any length, but whatever fate befalls, it must be always true to say that the danger to the Monarch's life has drawn from his people unmistakable proofs of genuine affection both to the Throne and to its gravely-stricken occupant. At one in this with all other religious creeds, Catholics have offered their heartfelt prayers for the prolongation of a beneficent life which has been an inspiration to all as an example of blameless behaviour and devotion to duty. A hundred years ago Catholics had much in their minds His Majesty's predecessors, the Third and the Fourth George, the former of whom postponed their civil emancipation for more than a generation and the latter only consented to it under the severest pressure. The contrast both in private and in public life between those monarchs and his present Majesty, who, as is well-known, flatly refused on his Accession to make the odious declaration against Transubstantiation, exacted from all previous monarchs, makes us realize how great has been the advance, both in the ideals of Kingship and in the matter of religious tolerance, since 1829. Our sympathies and prayers must be redoubled by that reflection, for even in these democratic days, a King's example has immense influence and that of King George has always been on the side of righteousness.

**Bolivia  
and  
Paraguay.**

The civilized world was shocked and disgusted to hear that on December 6th hostilities had broken out between Bolivia and Paraguay, two members of the League of Nations, on a question of frontier. The spectacle is a useful, if ugly, object-lesson of how

wars used to originate, before the League had elaborated more sensible ways of settling disputes. A frontier incident, retaliation, appeals to "national honour," bellicose mobs in the capitals, challenges in the respective newspapers, mutual recriminations, mobilization,—we are presented with all the usual invitations to passion to take the place of reason and find vent in war. Bolivia is about 600,000 square miles in area with a population of less than 3,000,000, 88 per cent. of which is Indian or mixed. Paraguay is much smaller, only some 62,000 square miles in extent, with a population of 700,000. The territory in dispute, the Chaco, is an immense tract of marsh land, with a sparse Indian population—a more trivial *casus belli* could not well be imagined. Bolivia being over-populated to the extent of five people to the square mile wants more of the marsh than Paraguay, more congested still with nearly twelve to the square mile, feels disposed to yield her. As both States date from the break-up of the Spanish Empire at the beginning of last century, they both appeal to immemorial tradition in support of their claims: those of the Chaco Indians who inhabit the region being, of course, ignored. The *opera-bouffe* character of this fracas does not prevent it from being an international scandal of the first magnitude. The League Council sent on December 11th a courteous reminder of their obligations to both disputants, and the Pan-American Congress sitting at Washington has also intervened. The boundary squabble, which is of very long standing, should long ago have been referred to the International Court, if these two States were really sincere about peace and took their membership of the League seriously. But the League's headquarters are half the globe apart from Asuncion and La Paz, and the South American States generally are luke-warm in their adherence to it. There is more immediate hope in the mediation of the Pan-American Congress which has been accepted by both parties, whilst the fact that Bolivian finance is largely in the hands of the United States gives that Power a very direct interest in peace. How affronted and alarmed the common sense of the world is by this return to a childish and barbaric method of settling disputes may be judged from the numbers of other offers of mediation—from Spain, Argentine., etc,—which have been made.

**Obstacles  
to the  
Peace Pact.**

President Coolidge said in his celebrated Armistice Day speech that "it is a long distance from a world that walks by force to a world that walks by faith." The trouble is that, even if all the nations have started on the journey, they do not travel by quite the same paths, or at quite the same rate. Bolivia and Paraguay have obviously halted by the way for the time. Others are trying to get themselves to trust in treaties and pacts, whilst ostentatiously "keeping their powder dry." Others, whilst gener-

ally renouncing war as a means of solving disputes, reserve their liberty of action in certain contingencies. All this is doubtless characteristic of a period of transition. The most the peace advocate can hope for is the gradual disappearance of the impedimenta which in many cases clog the advance to mutual trust between peoples, to be shown by their support of a common Court whose decisions will be enforced, if necessary, by a general guarantee. There is no getting away from the fact that, if world-peace is to be won, the several nations must give up what has hitherto been regarded as an essential mark of sovereignty—the right to assert at their own discretion their interests by force. Before the existence of the present fact of world-solidarity, displayed in commerce, finance, and social work, as well as in the higher things of the spirit—art, music, and literature—and until it was generally recognized that the common interests of humanity, above all, peace and security, are of higher value than individual goods, the several States could not, in justice to their charge, forego their duty to enforce their rights with whatever might they possessed. But now, considering on the one hand the devastating effects, moral and material, of warfare, and on the other, the existence of a World-Court capable of giving, at infinitely less cost, at least as just decisions as war could compass, a voluntary abandonment of that sovereign right would surely be prudent, just and beneficial. Contrariwise, any, even implicit, claim to be above the common law and to have interests which can only be protected by one's own right arm—saving always, what the individual retains, the right of immediate self-defence—is a withdrawal from the comity of nations and quite subversive of any hopes of establishing peace.

**War Blockade  
and the  
Monroe Doctrine.**

The British claim to the right of universal blockade in war time, the American claim to a sort of suzerainty over the entire New World, except the British possessions there, seem to be claims of this sort, and it is to be hoped that the two great Powers concerned will come to see what a hindrance these exceptions are to the progress of Peace. As regards the right of blockade, what it means in effect is, that if this country quarrels with another, all neutral nations must refrain from trading with that other lest it should be enabled the better to resist us. It is difficult to see any moral justification for that contention unless it be assumed that this country is wholly right in its quarrel and its enemy altogether wrong, or that we are struggling for our very existence. And as for the Monroe doctrine, it is simply an assertion on the part of the strongest Power in the New World of ultimate control over the intercourse of the rest of that hemisphere (Canada excepted) with the Old—a claim which, however beneficial in intention and effect, is based purely upon might. Out of a world,

from which the policy of war is going to be banished, it would seem that these two claims might fitly go too.

The  
Implications of  
the Pact.

This becomes more possible when we reflect that each of these great Powers claims the same privileges as the other. In a war with some Asiatic or New World State, America would certainly do her best to prevent that State from receiving help from neutrals: one of her reasons for maintaining so large a Fleet is precisely that she may be able to control commerce in war-time to her own advantage. On the other hand, there are regions in the Old World in regard to which Great Britain maintains a sort of Monroe doctrine—Egypt, for instance, and Palestine. These facts must be faced when the full implications of the Kellogg Pact come to be considered. Mr. Baldwin has said of it (November 9) "it is so tremendous a thing that few of us realize it: the result of our signature will be nothing, unless the nations, realizing to what they are committed, make up their minds that their signatures shall be honoured till the end of time." The commitment, *vi verborum*, is to the universal abandonment of the threat of force in international negotiations. M. Painlevé does not yet seem to realize it for, defending the French military estimates on November 28, he asked: "Would M. Briand be able to speak with the proper authority at Geneva if he merely represented an enfeebled France?" That is the old mentality. Even at Geneva, presumably, reason and justice are of little avail unless backed by visible force. It is the argument of the "navalists" of every land. "A strong Fleet is needed to impress the world with our strength; it must be the symbol of our greatness which it will cause the most remote peoples to recognize: it must be at hand everywhere to enforce our interests wherever threatened." We constantly meet the phrase, "The Fleet must be maintained at a strength consistent with the demands of our safety." But in a warless world our safety will make no demands; and in a world where the seas are policed, not in merely national interest but for the security of all by a Fleet commissioned internationally, our safety will demand very much less than it demands now. When the United States ratifies the Pact, as it perhaps may before these words are printed, and when sixty other nations follow that example, then the problem of disarmament, naval and military, will take an entirely new aspect, and a solution will be more speedily and satisfactorily attained.

Distress  
in  
the Coal-fields.

It took some time to arouse the public conscience and the Government as representing it, to the fact that, as a bye-product of modern Capitalism, some quarter of a million people in this comparatively rich country were in process of starvation. That there

was distress in the Welsh coal-fields has been known for a year past : how deep and widespread the distress has only lately been realized. The response to that appeal has been worthy of the season : both public and private generosity is being organized on a very large scale, and it is to be hoped that the distressed miners and their families will be enabled to face the winter in relative comfort. But it is not a good Christmas dinner that is in question : it is a good dinner every day and all the year through that a modern civilized State should be able to secure for all its citizens. Socialism as a system is impracticable and undesirable : even if it managed to secure material well-being, that could only be at the cost of higher things,—independence, initiative, liberty of conscience and a sound family-life. But when society has been brought into so abnormal a condition, both by unchecked individualism and unregulated trusts, some relief methods of a socialistic nature may be found the only resource. In these circumstances the Government is justified in controlling and regulating industry, or compelling it to control and regulate itself, so that its output may be more economically produced and its profits more equitably shared. Of the coal industry it is said that it is over-staffed to the extent of 200,000, and that no return of prosperity can be expected to absorb that surplus. If that is so, it is surely the duty of the State to adopt a real remedy, not merely to tinker with palliatives, such as assisted emigration or exhortation to employers or transfer of labour. In an emergency like war, the State in a month or two could feed, clothe, house and equip a million men or so. The present emergency calls for something of the sort. Unemployment grants, amounting to millions in the aggregate, keep men alive in idleness : even if a few more millions were needed to make them live and work, the sum would be well and profitably spent. All home trade languishes if the multitude have little to spend, and the positive value of the work that could be done—reclamation, forestry, road-making, agriculture generally—would remain a national asset. It is, doubtless, easy to criticize and not easy to suggest remedies, but our leaders are there precisely to find remedies and to forestall criticism. Over the whole coal question hangs the blight of the strike, which the expenditure of 23 million pounds could not avert, and the Samuel Report which the coal-owners rejected. It is to be hoped that this second Government intervention on behalf of labour may be more successful.

**State Intervention  
necessary to restore  
Industry.**

The reluctance of Government to interfere with private enterprise, except by way of such factory regulations, etc., as give some measure of protection to those who are employed by it, is altogether in the spirit of traditional British individualism. But a *laissez faire* attitude, suitable for normal conditions, is wholly

out of place in a society thoroughly dislocated by the effects of the war. No Government since the war has shown that it has realized this. All have been waiting and hoping for a return to pre-war conditions in home and foreign trade, which, though attended by many labour conflicts, did keep the country in a state of moderate prosperity. But these conditions seem to have gone for ever. As a means of providing employment for all the inhabitants of this country, the capitalist system has broken down. Those who are interested in its recovery and maintenance should see how it can be set up again and made to function properly. Mr. Baldwin at Glasgow a few weeks ago, touched on one blot on the system, the prevalence of "guinea-pig" directors, who are in effect much more costly than the phrase would suggest. From their very first start, he said "there have battened on the joint-stock companies large numbers of men, connected with management, and directors, who are parasitical to industry and nothing but parasitical, . . . who will not for the sake of rationalization remove themselves, unless they be bribed to do so." And seemingly the bribes exacted are very heavy. But "rationalization," which means the use in industry of the best machinery and the cleverest management and the most skilful workers, together with the elimination of all uneconomic adjuncts and the avoidance of cut-throat competition, will not of itself restore prosperity and may well increase unemployment. Nor will the artificial stimulation of industries by the exclusion of all foreign competition. Tariffs, except in rare cases, make things dearer for the consumer and thus lessen sales. It is strange to find a capitalist like Lord Melchett, who has shown much more enlightenment than most of his class, advocating (November 29th) a "tariff-wall round the Empire." The whole post-war endeavour has been to break down tariffs, as barriers to the healthful flow of trade. One of the activities of the League of Nations, the International Economic Conference, is constantly at work, with the aim of promoting peace, to remove such obstacles to international trade. The endeavour suggested by Lord Melchett to make the Commonwealth a self-contained unit, commercially armed against the rest of the world, goes directly against the peace-movement and not all the credit which is due to that great financier for his work to promote peace at home by means of the Industrial Conference, can free him from the reproach of thus, indirectly as yet and remotely, preparing the ground for war abroad.

Especially the  
Industry  
of Agriculture.

But although a self-supporting Commonwealth, independent of other nations and yet interfering with their prosperity, is undesirable, in our present progress towards a complete world solidarity, there is no reason why these islands should not aim at

being less dependent on foreigners for their food supplies. We are convinced that the root remedy for unemployment—the one fundamental problem of the day—is to divert the labour which mechanical industry cannot absorb to the oldest and most essential industry of all, agriculture in each of its branches. At one time when the country was much less populous than now, the land workers numbered  $3\frac{1}{2}$  millions: to-day they have sunk to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions. England has now only 4 per cent. of her population engaged in agriculture, whereas France has 48 per cent., and Germany 35 per cent. Yet soil and climate here are in no ways inferior to those of the Continent. In the last ten years three million acres of English arable land have gone out of cultivation, and the workers have crowded into the already congested towns. This desertion of the country was not, we may suppose, due to a rooted distaste for the woods and fields and the agricultural life in itself: the success of the allotment schemes and small holdings shows that: it was because of the low agricultural wage and the lack of social amenities. It is possible, now that transport has so greatly improved, to keep the land-worker in closer touch with various forms of amusement. Whether he can be given a fair living wage depends on the fortunes of agriculture generally. That those should be improved, the welfare and stability of the whole country demands: that they can be improved, our belief in the common sense and practical skill of our agricultural leaders persuades us. Happily they are about to take action on a national scale. A Conference has been summoned to meet early next month, "to frame an agricultural policy acceptable in fundamentals to all political parties," by the Council of the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture. Some practical wisdom ought to issue from such a debate between experts and politicians. The fact that Canada can swamp us with cheap wheat—it is well for our poor that she can—shows that attention should be paid to the hundred other varieties of agricultural produce, and the widely diversified nature of agricultural pursuits. And encouragement to take large views and attempt great schemes may be drawn from the success of the League of Nations "Greek Refugee Settlement Commission," which, in four years and at the expenditure of some £9,000,000, has settled on the land, in comfortable, well-appointed, self-supporting village communities, 143,000 families—a work involving the erection of 50,000 houses, and the stocking and equipment of as many farms. The result has been an immense increase of the wealth and prosperity of Greece. We on our part have spent since 1920 on an average £50,000,000 a year in maintaining some 200,000 unemployed, our land the while going out of cultivation. If those men and their families were settled on the soil, every other industry and the country at large would benefit out of all proportion.

"Comprehensiveness" once more.

As a symbolical colour, green is associated with hope; in popular usage it indicates simplicity: both these qualities are suggested by the editorial comments in the Winter issue of a little "Anglo-Catholic" journal, aptly styled *The Green Quarterly*. The editor may claim to be the author of the discovery that the flank of the main attack upon Anglicanism may be neatly turned by claiming as a virtue what is actually a radical defect in its constitution, viz., its inability to frame a definite rule of faith. A Church truly Catholic, runs his argument, must suit all "temperaments": belief is not merely adhesion to an outward rule but mainly to some inner criterion dependent upon idiosyncrasy. You cannot expect the critical Modernist to believe exactly the same things as the emotional Evangelical or the ritualistic "Anglo-Catholic." Provided only they are united in the acceptance of "fundamental truth," let them follow their constitutional bent as to the amount and character of other things they believe and let them be gently tolerant of each other's convictions. True Catholicity is Comprehensiveness. So, in effect, *The Green Quarterly*, ignoring in its naive optimism much history and not a little experience. We may note an admission that the unfortunate Church of which it speaks has not yet "found herself":

The first duty of a comprehensive Church is *not to set limits to her membership*, [how misleading then, that metaphor of the Fold, used with such emphasis by Our Lord and St. Paul!] but to *discover the bedrock of fundamental belief* which will bind all professing members together. *When* that has been established—and we *hope* that the Archbishop's Committee on doctrine will help effectually in the task—it is possible to begin to work outwards and to *extend the idea of tolerance*, so as to include the *largest possible* amount of variety of *interpretation of faith* and forms of worship. Any institution *must* have its boundaries. But to *define its boundaries first*, and to hunt out those who will not come within the area, seems to us an unfortunate and an undesirable method.

We have ventured to italicize some of the significant words in the above extraordinary sketch of a Church claiming to be founded by Christ. Anglicanism, according to this apologist, has not yet discovered its fundamental beliefs. The Bishops are exhorted to summon "a round-table conference out of which would *almost certainly* evolve the basis of a lasting settlement." And the writer hopes for help from the Archbishop's Committee on doctrine, that secretly-functioning body of experts whose brief annual emergence into daylight is awaited with such wistful interest. Why, we may ask, is this so-called Christian Church, two thousand years or so after Pentecost, still at a loss to know its fundamental beliefs; and how, we may wonder, are they to be discovered by a "round-

table conference" of uninspired and fallible men? And this lowest common measure of the opinions of those present, once discovered, surely will only represent the opinions of those present, for they have no right and make no claim to dictate the beliefs of the rest of their community. Is it hope or simplicity that inspires the editor's expectation that, with this vague and shifting "bedrock" as a basis, the limits of tolerance could be adequately defined? Assuming that, with the assistance of the Archbishop's Committee, the "fundamental belief" of Anglicanism has been determined, who is to impose it on a Church which does not acknowledge a teaching authority in its pastors? And in any case if "temperament" and "mentality" are to be allowed to qualify one's acceptance of truth which is not labelled "fundamental," why should even fundamental truths escape similar personal modification?

*The Green Quarterly, more Anglicano*, is the victim of phrases and a slave to clichés. It dwells in its traditional fog. It does not desire to excommunicate anyone, "provided there were a fundamental unity between us as to essential truths," but it does not venture to say who is to determine what is an essential truth. It speaks of a "common allegiance" but the loyalty evoked is not to a representative of Christ but merely to some mental conception, labelled "fundamental truth" and supposed to be shared with others. It rings the changes on "unity without uniformity," "a solid basis of common belief," "union in their fundamental faith," without once facing the fact that there is no apparatus in Anglicanism for finally reaching fundamental truth. And so the Church of its allegiance is always a thing in the future, something to be still evolved, or very possibly not to be evolved,—so much depends on contingencies never hitherto realized. Here, finally, is the editor's summing-up of the situation, wherein, we fear, simplicity predominates over hope:—"We are convinced that this problem could be solved, if sensible leaders of the various schools of thought [no Anglican pronouncement is complete without *that* phrase] met together in conference for the express purpose of solving it."

We have from time to time used as an argument  
 Vagueness against the pretensions of Anglicanism that it  
 Claimed as a note is vague and variable in its tenets, ill-defined in  
 of Anglicanism. its outline of belief, difficult to recognize as a  
 part of the Church, wholly unlike the "City-set-upon-a-Hill" which  
 Christ said His Church should be. But now, like its futile boast  
 of comprehensiveness, this further characteristic is being claimed  
 as a virtue. Lord Hugh Cecil in a recent *Times* letter (of which  
 the date has unfortunately been mislaid) assured us that Christ  
 meant revealed truth to be difficult to find. And lately Canon  
 Goudge of Oxford<sup>1</sup> has spoken of the world around us as "a twi-  
 light world." On the other hand, *The Times*' Saturday homilist,

<sup>1</sup> The Roman Controversy: v. *Tablet*, Dec. 15, p. 809.

in an impressive discourse on "Vagueness or Mists in the Soul" (October 20th), proclaims, quite in the Catholic spirit, that "the essential worth of personality depends on the certitude of faith and the confidence it inspires" and laments "the wide-spread harm in the moral and spiritual life of men," of which vagueness, "more than any other evil," is the source. This is common sense : knowledge is a predisposition to action, certain knowledge, to consistent and energetic action,—especially in the region of morality where right action often necessitates a struggle. Nothing but the exigencies of an illogical position could compel earnest and educated men to try to excuse, under the guise of "comprehensiveness" or "reluctance to define," the inability of Anglicanism to guide souls to truth. The world outside the Church is indeed in the twilight or the darkness, but Christ sent His disciples to be the "light of the world." What help in this way can be hoped for from a "Church" which is still confessedly groping to find its "fundamental beliefs"?

Catholic  
Education in  
Scotland.

Act of 1918 Catholic Schools were transferred to the management of the local elective Education Authority, in which Catholics could gain representation in proportion to their numbers, the new Bill abolishes these local committees and transfers their powers to the County Councils, to which only a few denominational representatives are to be co-opted. The result will be that Catholic schools will be bereft of that protection, the existence of which was a *sine qua non* of their giving up complete Catholic control. Other denominations besides the Catholics are also making protest and have made clear to the Government that they will oppose the new Measure unless means are taken to make the position of their schools just as secure as they are at present under the Act of 1918.

In England the new Catholic Societies Education Committee, which has been entrusted by the Bishops with the task of safeguarding and advancing our educational interests, in view of administrative action by the Government, has begun excellently by the issue of a luminous pamphlet called "A Statement of the Present Position of Catholic Schools in England and Wales." Therein is collected and tabulated everything that is necessary to show the reasoned strength of our demand for equality of treatment in the eyes of the law. Our main difficulty is, that whereas the law sets little store on definite religious instruction, we Catholics consider it the very essence of true education, and therefore cannot take our places in a uniform system which ignores it. To ignore it to our detriment is to fall short of justice : and it will not be for want of evidence of this if our non-Catholic fellow-citizens fail to agree with us.

Into the financial mysteries of de-rating the non-expert will be wise not to investigate but some at least of its effects are patent to the casual observer. As affecting Scotland, where by the

THE EDITOR.

## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Church and State, Relations of** [Archbishop Downey, reported in *Catholic Times*, Dec. 14, 1928, p. 1].

**Evolution**, Present state of evidence for [A. F. Frumweller, S.J., in *Thought*, Dec. 1928, p. 5111: Reasons for caution regarding, B. Grimley, D.D., in *Catholic Gazette*, Dec. 1928, p. 395].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Anglican Crisis, The Recurrent** [Joseph Keating, S.J., in *Studies*, Dec. 1928, p. 546].

**Bigotry in U.S.A. Analysis of the Cause of** [S. K. Wilson in *Thought*, Dec. 1928, p. 357].

**Catholicism its own evidence** [*Universe*, Nov. 30, 1928, p. 12].

**Catholics banned from U.S. Presidency** [Rev. P. O'Riordan in *Universe*, Nov. 30, 1928, p. 7: Reasoned diagnosis of the result, Fr. James Gillis in *Catholic World*, Dec. 1928, p. 355].

**"Frazerism": the insufficiency of** [A. Condamin in *Revue Apologetique*, Dec. 1928, p. 683].

**Indifferentism, Origins of** [John A. O'Brien in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Dec. 1928, p. 596].

**Popes, The, and Medicine** [J. J. Walsh in *Commonweal* Nov. 28, 1928, p. 99].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Colored Question, New Light on** [M. S. Sheehy in *America*, Dec. 8, 1928, p. 200].

**Conversion, Psychological Aspects of** [Dr. C. Bruehl in *Homiletic Review*, Dec. 1928, p. 233].

**Education: the Hadow Report** [Bishop Browne in *Catholic Times*, Nov. 30, 1928, p. 14: Catholic Rights, by Archbishop of Cardiff, *Tablet*, Dec. 1, 1928, p. 714].

**Equality, The True Basis of** [J. A. Ryan, D.D., in *Commonweal*, Dec. 5, 1928, p. 125].

**Monroe Doctrine: Examination of** [L. Izaga in *Razon y Fé*, Oct. 10, Nov. 25, 1928].

**National Catholic Welfare Conference (U.S.A.) A Year's activities** [*Universe*, Nov. 30, 1928, pp. 1 and 16].

**Population Problems not soluble by Birth Prevention** [Dr. H. Sutherland in *Universe*, Nov. 30, Dec. 7, 1928].

**Prohibition, Judge Taft foresees and condemns** [J. Wiltby in *America*, Oct. 20, 1928, p. 41].

**Sterilization anti-human** [Dr. T. J. Colvin in *Catholic Times*, Nov. 30, 1928, p. 7].

**Urban life diminishes fertility: hence decline of Irish population in U.S.A.** [M. V. Kelly in *America*, Nov. 24, 1928, p. 155].

# REVIEWS

## I.—STUDIES OF CHRIST<sup>1</sup>

TO every student of the Life of Christ the name of L. C. Fillion, S.S. has been, for over a quarter of a century, very familiar. A pupil of Vigouroux, the editor of the great French Dictionary of the Bible, he has spent his long life in the closest research, finding out all he could, from every kind of source, concerning the Person and History of Christ Our Lord. In the course of his life, besides articles and essays, he has published more than twenty volumes on the Bible, including a complete translation of the New Testament, commentaries on the four Gospels, and three different atlases of the Bible. One may claim that no writer has ever undertaken to write a Life of Christ more provided with material than Fillion.

This fact alone will give us the chief characteristic of his work, in comparison with that of others who have covered the same field. He is essentially encyclopædic, he is anxious to tell us all there is to know; he is careful to give us references for every assertion that he makes. In mind he is conservative; some may think that in this he is too cautious, but as a Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission he evidently chose to reserve his final judgment where questions were still open. From the beginning to the end of his life he kept perhaps mainly in view the refutation of the rationalist critics; but in questions in which Christian critics are at variance he preferred to give both sides, seldom even suggesting that to which he was most inclined.

These remarks will help readers to gauge the value of this translation of the holy Sulpician's *magnum opus*. Like the original, the English version will be complete in three volumes. The first volume is mainly introductory, but on that account it is perhaps the most valuable of the three. The first part deals with the Sources, and with the Environment, geographical, political, and religious; in all this part Fillion is in his element, and so far as an author in a work of this kind can be, he is exhaustive. The second part, dealing with Christ before the Incarnation, *sc.* in

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Christ*. By Rev. L. C. Fillion, S.S. Authorized translation from the latest French edition. By Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D. London: Herder. Vols. I and II. Pp. 456: viii. 720. Price, 16s. each.

*The Life of Christ*. By Père Didon, O.P. New (sixth) abridged edition in one volume. London: Kegan Paul. Pp. xv. 399. Price 10s. 6d. net.

*Christ in the Old and the New Testament*. By Sister Mary Gonzaga, Ph.D. With a preface by the Bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind. London: Herder. Pp. xvi. 697. Price 10s. 6d.

*The Shining Mystery of Jesus*. By Douglas Edwards, M.A. London: Longmans. Pp. xiii. 178. Price 6s. net.

type and prophecy, is but lightly treated ; the author leaves that branch of the subject to the theologians. The third part gives us the Infancy and Hidden Life. Fillion takes as his basis the theory of the Public Life lasting three years and a little more, though he admits the strong evidence for the shorter term, now, perhaps, more commonly held. The last portion of this part, where the author analyses the development of Christ and His human personality, shows him in his most original, and, let us add, his most devotional vein.

The second volume contains the history of the Public Life till immediately after the Transfiguration. Fillion accepts the four-pasch theory for the settlement of its length, though he does not argue against the three-pasch theory, accepted by Lagrange and others. Again, as in the former volume, while he keeps well before him the Life he has undertaken to describe, he does not lose sight of the rationalist views, either in the text or in the notes. For this reason some of his general chapters are specially useful and interesting : The Messianic Consciousness and Plan, General View of Christ's Preaching, General View of Christ's Miracles, Christ's Preaching in the Form of Parables, and the like. Throughout his account he is at pains to emphasize the opposition with which Our Lord was faced at every turn. Like other students of the Gospels, the more he has endeavoured to realize the facts the more the spirit of the Gospel of St. John has grown upon him. The synoptists may give us more details, but when those details are put together it is astonishing how they confirm the reflections of the Fourth Evangelist. There is a long array of Appendices, discussing most of the problems that arise in regard to the Public Life.

The translator has undoubtedly done his work well. We have followed him in many places line by line, and have been struck by his happy turning of French phrases into English idiom, and of the more elaborate French sentences into simple Anglo-Saxon. Except the very long bibliography at the end of the original, most of which could be of little use to the ordinary English reader, nothing has been omitted ; Dr. Thompson has given us all the appendices, most valuable for apologetic purposes ; he has even rendered faithfully the footnotes and countless references. We could have wished that the price were not so high, but perhaps this was inevitable. Perhaps in time there will be found occasion to produce a cheaper edition, printed in a cheaper style.

It is most gratifying to find that Messrs. Kegan Paul have found it well to publish a new abridged edition in one volume of their English translation of *Didon's Life of Christ*. Readers will easily recognize that this has meant much condensation and omission. To the present reviewer by far the most important of the original work is the Preface, running into eighty-eight pages ; in this edition it

has unfortunately been found necessary to reduce it to four. But apart from this, the present edition is, on the whole, satisfactory. Didon's method is that, more or less, of elaborate paraphrase. The gifted Dominican, who, in his day, had a command of his native French that was unsurpassed, spoke and wrote of his Lord and Master with captivating eloquence; and it is this winning, convincing manner which makes the value of his work, in contrast with the more scientific method of Fillion. Sometimes when reading Didon one wishes that he had covered less ground, and had instead confined himself to the elaboration of some detail, more after the manner of Papini. We are bound to add that the Scripture in this translation is quoted from the Authorized Version and that it has no English *Imprimatur*.

Another volume on the same inexhaustible subject which has come to us is *Christ in the Old and the New Testament*, by Sister Mary Gonzaga, Ph.D., of the Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ, with a Preface by his Lordship the Bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind. The sub-title describes this work as "Bible and Catechism combined"; and this gives an accurate idea of the author's aim. In an able introduction she reflects upon the age and its needs; and she attempts to supply this need by stirring "a more living, a more effective belief in Christ, the Son of God and God-made-man . . . not so much from the study of each lesson, as from a more comprehensive knowledge of Jesus which the study will give, and the true fellowship with God to which such knowledge will lead those who have open minds and docile hearts." The book is a genuine Life, of some 700 pages, into which are woven as occasion offers doctrinal reflections and explanations, all in accordance with the teachings of Catholic theology and, perhaps more, of Catholic philosophy of life. An admirable index, covering many pages, makes the book easily of use for those who would combine the Life of Christ with their catechetical instructions.

Of quite another school is a fourth volume which we have received, *The Shining Mystery of Jesus*, by Douglas Edwards, M.A., with a Preface by the Bishop of Manchester. The author gives us the impression of fighting with his back to the wall; but he fights for a good cause and he fights well. He begins where he feels that he is on common ground; for the sake of argument he sets aside the Fourth Gospel and confines himself to the synoptists, though in the course of his book we are pleased to see that he does not leave St. John altogether aside. His appeal is threefold: The unique Figure of Our Lord, so unique that He must indeed be very God; the part He has in the Kingdom, so unique again that only by being one with God can He be justified in His claim; the fact of the Resurrection, and again all that this implies in regard to Jesus Christ. The author is in real earnest.

Whatever one may think of some concessions, especially in the third part of his thesis, or of his setting of the doctrine of the Atonement, he is to be congratulated, in this age of hesitation and avoidance of definition among our non-Catholic brethren, for having boldly said that, according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Jesus Christ is truly God.

## 2—CONCERNING MEDICINE<sup>1</sup>

CULTURE is the faculty of appreciating the best, and those who address medical students often seek to enlarge the outlook of their audience by citing the wisdom of the past. Now while quotation serves "To point a moral or adorn a tale," an oration is apt to be tedious, and a book even more so, when mostly a compilation of the sayings of other men, widely separated in time. Moreover very few essays, and fewer speeches, have sufficient vitality to withstand rejuvenation in book form.

These reflections are awakened by *Aspects of Age, Life and Disease*, by Sir Humphrey Rolleston. This book is a reprint of thirteen addresses on—Old Age—Diseases described by medical men who suffered from them—Medical Aspects of Holidays—Medical Aspects of Tobacco—Quackery—and other diverse topics. In treating of Professional Careers, and of Success, the author, in place of literary research, relies on his experience, and these are the most interesting pages in the book.

The Address on Poetry and Physic contains a most disturbing revelation: "Of the various specialties one of the most select (*sic*) is that of the anæsthetist, and I have personal knowledge of some who, possibly inspired by their environment and provided with time for meditation *whilst their surgeons are busy*, have cultivated verse" (the italics are mine), and a large practice now awaits the anæsthetist to whom poetry makes no appeal. In his list of medical poetasters the author omits the name of Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh, and yet he was a poet, although more famous as the author of "Rab and his friends," which won from Swinburne a very noble sonnet.

Sir Humphrey Rolleston does not deal with Prose and Physic, although good prose is the greatest need of teachers of medicine. Much time, trouble, and money would be saved on medical education if our text-books were better written. There are brilliant exceptions, such as the late Charles Mercier who wrote firm English, but most teachers, when they do make an effort, culti-

<sup>1</sup> *The Anglo-French Library of Medical and Biological Science*. Published by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., London. (1) *Aspects of Age, Life and Disease*. Sir Humphrey Rolleston. Small demy 8vo. Pp. 304. Price 10s. 6d. (2) *Epidemiology, Old and New*. Sir William Hamer. Small demy 8vo. Pp. 180. Price 9s.

vate that imitative prose called precious, which is even more irritating than bad syntax because it is less original.

Sir William Hamer, in *Epidemiology Old and New*, writes of the great epidemics of the past 250 years, having devoted forty years to this study. His book is technical, but clearly written and records a great advance in medical science because, after fifty years of the germ theory, we are back to Hippocrates. The Father of Medicine conceived diseases to arise "partly from the particles of the atmosphere and partly from the different fermentations and putrefactions of the humours." The former "taint the human frame, but they depend upon the peculiar erases of our blood and humours only so far as these occult atmospheric influences have made an impression on them."

And now Sir William Hamer proves that the descent of cold air from the "substratosphere" (5 to 9 kilometres above the earth) influences the influenzal death-rate, and that diseases have passed and are passing over the world in waves.

HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND, M.D.

### 3—THE CALVERT SERIES<sup>1</sup>

ANOTHER five volumes of this valuable expository series have appeared, dealing with subjects regarding which the Church's doctrine is commonly misunderstood and misrepresented. Fr. Pope's explanation of the relations of the Scriptures with the Church is especially opportune, now that they have fallen into such neglect and disrepute outside her fold. He shows that it was the Catholic Church that composed and preserved the New Testament, and that her various regulations regarding the use of the Vernacular Scriptures were meant precisely to prevent the fate which has befallen them outside her guardianship. A most timely and excellent little treatise, which Catholics may read with profit and non-Catholics with salutary shame.

The greatest menace to modern civilization is not the persistence of the war-spirit nor the worship of Mammon with which it is allied, but rather the decay in reverence and understanding of the institution of matrimony, manifested in the spread of divorce, concubinage, and birth prevention. It may be that immorality has been more openly violated in earlier days, but now various writers strive to justify vice by attacking the very foundations of virtue. And nowhere save in the Catholic Church, is there a sound and reasoned defence of what is the very basis of

<sup>1</sup> *The Catholic Church and the Bible.* By Hugh Pope, O.P. Pp. 106. *The Catholic Church and the Home.* By James M. Gillis, C.P. Pp. 116. *The Catholic Church and Confession.* By L. Geddes, S.J., and H. Thurston, S.J. Pp. 104. *The Catholic Church and the Citizen.* By John A. Ryan. Pp. 94. *The Catholic Church and Healing.* By James J. Walsh. Pp. 109. London. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Price, each, 4s.

Christian civilization. Fr. James Gillis, C.P., in his trenchant style, sets forth in his valuable treatise, the nature of the disease, the need of an immediate remedy, the efficacious prescriptions of the Church, the inevitable results of neglecting her counsel. The reader of these well-documented pages will be aghast at the evidence collected therein of a widespread return to Pagan morality, or rather a descent to something worse than bestial behaviour, advocated by talented and educated people. Those people in turn, will learn from these pages what otherwise they might never learn, how the normally decent mind reacts to their obscenities. This is a book for all who wish to do their share in stemming the evil of the age and saving the world from its own corruption.

Not inaptly does *The Catholic Church and Confession* find itself in proximity to the former volume. Frs. Geddes and Thurston deal with their subject both historically and didactically, showing on the one hand the very gradual growth of the penitential discipline of the Church and on the other the need and efficacy of this divine remedy for human weakness. Moral truth is easily apprehended but less easily followed; it is through the grace and enlightenment of the confessional that man's stumbling progress is assured.

Recent events in the United States and the recollection of our own emancipation from a condition of partial outlawry give especial point to Dr. John A. Ryan's treatise on Catholic Citizenship. Membership of a visible, active, cosmopolitan organization naturally modifies one's relations with one's own civil government and the task of the Catholic apologist is to show that civil allegiance is perfected rather than impaired by the profession of Catholicism. This Dr. Ryan does with conspicuous success, deriving the binding force of all law from the Will of God, and showing that, except in matters of conscience, the Church has no concern with civil administration. One important chapter is concerned with the binding force in conscience of purely civil law, and Dr. Ryan here upholds the stricter view, in opposition to the supposed teaching of Fr. Vermeersch, a veteran Belgian moralist. The quarrel is an old one, and we suspect, could be resolved by a clearer definition of terms and reference to varieties of local estimates. But no one denies that if the civil legislator means his (just) laws to bind in conscience, he may make them so. On the other hand, the Austinian conception of law, common outside the Church, ascribes all the obligation of law to the physical force behind it. Dr. Ryan's book will be a useful weapon for the Catholic apologist.

No one could be better fitted by scholarly research to deal with the history and attitude of the Church in regard to medicine than Dr. James J. Walsh, to whom Catholics are so much indebted for a vindication of their Faith from various unhistorical slanders. In this book he makes good the claim of the Church

to have been almost as solicitous for the body as for the soul of man; the originator of every sort of organization for the alleviation of bodily ills. Dr. Walsh confines himself to the historical aspects of the subject without treating of the ethical, but even the Catholic will be surprised to learn how much medical science and medical practice owe to ecclesiastics and religious folk.

This excellent series suffers somewhat from want of uniformity of editing; *e.g.*, the type differs in different volumes, while some have editorial prefaces and indexes and others have not.

### SHORT NOTICES.

#### THEOLOGICAL.

**S**TUDENTS of the Eastern Schismatical Church will find much to interest them in *La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila, Métropolitée de Kiev (1633—1646)* published by Father Antoine Malvy, S.J. and Father Marcel Viller, S.J. (*Orientalia Christiana*, X. n. 30. Beauchesne) in the useful series for which the Oriental Institute in Rome is responsible.

The main object of the work is to print for the first time from a Paris MS. the Latin translation of the "Orthodox Confession" which was itself translated into Greek from a Latin document drawn up by Peter Moghila. This, with a change here and there to agree with the prevailing Greek opinion, was issued as the authoritative expression of "Orthodox" doctrine. It was principally directed against Protestantism and was due to the desire to repair the harm done by the leaning to Calvinism shown by the patriarch of Constantinople (1620—1648), Cyril Lucaris, who was the correspondent among others of Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the donor of the Codex Alexandrinus to Charles I.

Father Malvy and Father Viller are to be congratulated on a fine and complete piece of work which is moreover furnished with several useful indices. There are studies of Peter Moghila and Cyril Lucaris, an account of the genesis of the "Orthodox Confession," a discussion on the Paris MS. of the Latin translation, an examination of the Latin sources of Moghila's doctrine which are shown to be the Catechism of the Council of Trent and that of St. Peter Canisius. The text in Latin of Peter Moghila's Little Catechism is printed in full, and shows that he held the doctrines of the Church on the moment of consecration at Mass and on Purgatory. That is followed by the Latin translation of the "Orthodox Confession," which is shown to have been drawn up with the original Latin text as a guide. The book closes with some 30 complementary notes on points of Eastern belief and practice and with a list of *Addenda* and *Corrigenda*.

#### MORAL THEOLOGY.

The monograph entitled *De Conscientia* (Dessain, author and price not stated), is part of the text of Moral Theology in use in the Archiepiscopal Seminary of Malines. It contains all that can be said on Conscience, and the treatment is scholarly and exact. The special merit of this handbook, we believe, is the very full historical treatment of the

various moral systems that have been devised for the solving of doubt, and the impartial examination of each system. The author admits neither the system of probabiliorism, nor of aequiprobabilism, nor the so-called system of "compensation" as a distinct advance, since, he rightly says, it practically coincides with probabilism. The universal principle which he adopts is the "sufficient reason," but do not think that this is any more helpful than pure probabilism. If, as the author alleges, there is this weak point in probabilism, namely, that it cannot lay down a universal principle that will apply both to lawful action, and to acts where the validity of a result is at stake, there is, we think, an equally weak point in the "sufficient reason" system, that it has to fall back, in certain cases, on probabiliorism. We strongly recommend this very admirable treatise to all students of Moral Theology.

#### CANON LAW.

Canon A. De Meester's work on the Code—*Iuris Canonici et Iuris Canonico-Civilis Compendium* (Desclée, Bruges),—is a thorough re-fashioning in accordance with the code of Canon Law of the well-known *Compendium* of De Brabanden and Van Coillie. The part that is dealt with in the work before us is part 2 of Volume III. This deals with books iv. and v. of the Code. The commentary on the procedure in the courts of the Church is meant principally for canonists; that on crimes and penalties, especially that portion of it which deals with "censures," has a more general interest. The Commentary with its very many references shows very wide reading, and is careful to state when there is a division of opinion among canonists. The discussion of the points raised by the Canons is solid and closely reasoned. The study of it should prove a first-rate education in canon law. We notice, however, in the explanation of Canon 2319 §1, n. 1., which refers back to Canon 1063 §1, that the author takes no account of the adverb "quoque" and the words that follow it in Canon 1063 §1. In other words, according to Canon De Meester, a Catholic, by the fact of attempting to contract marriage with a baptized Protestant before an heretical minister as such, incurs excommunication reserved to the local Ordinary. Canon 1063 §1, however, seems to require that the going before an heretical minister should take place either before or after the ceremony before the lawful minister, and that there should, of course, be a moral union between the two acts.

#### HISTORICAL.

We are glad that such a well-informed and well-documented account of the recent Anglican crisis as Abbé J. Couturier's *Le "Book of Common Prayer" et l'Eglise Anglicane* (Editions Spes: 6.00 fr.) should be made available for the French-reading public at this time. For the Anglican crisis is not over and this New Year will see a vigorous recurrence of it. It is well then that Catholics abroad, who are naturally not well acquainted with English Catholic literature on the subject, should have provided for them a clear and succinct account of the meaning of the Prayer Book controversy, showing historically how the Book was formed and modified at different times, and detailing all the circumstances and doctrinal significance, of the latest attempts at revision. The Abbé, at least, is well-read in the subject, and takes

careful note of the dangers to historical and theological truth involved in that emotional and eclectic approach to the subject which is conveniently called Portalism. As a useful summary of the whole controversy, the like of which does not yet exist in our own tongue, the Abbé's volume, which has various appendices, giving the oaths of Supremacy etc. and the divergences of the different Prayer Books from the Missal will be found very valuable by English readers as well.

It was a happy idea in view of current controversies to reissue in handy form a celebrated book which, familiar to all students of the Anglican question, has been long out of print. First published in 1891, and reprinted in 1892, **Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer** (Sheed and Ward: 7s. 6d. n.), by H. E. Cardinal Gasquet and the late Mr. Bishop, puts beyond all manner of doubt both what Cranmer intended to do, in compiling the comprehensive English liturgy and service book in 1549 and in 1552, and what he succeeded in doing, viz., to abolish in his new religion the central act of worship of the Catholic Church, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The book has never been answered: it can only be evaded and avoided, for it gives the death-blow to continuity of doctrine between the new Church and the old. It should be cherished and circulated as widely as possible by all who are zealous for the truth of history and for the spread of Catholicity. Only by ignoring its testimony can certain zealous Anglicans persuade themselves that they are "Mass-Priests," and their deluded flocks imagine that their Church can really administer the sacraments of penance and incorporation.

#### LITERARY.

We do not know whether there is room to-day for books on the Latin Classics written in classical Latin, but if there is, then the volume entitled **De Litteris Latinis Commentarii, Libri v.**, by Prof. Eugenio de Rosa (Ex Officina R. G. Riccetto, Trapani: 45 lire) should have an honoured place. In the first place the author's Latin is quite exceptionally classical, the reading of which cannot but help the style of any aspiring student. Secondly, for the subject matter, the book carries one from the beginnings of Latin literature to well beyond the classical period, ending with the capture of Rome by Odoacer in A.D. 476. Thus it includes the early Christian writers to Augustine, as well as that curious period of philosophy and ribaldry of the later Empire. The list of authors brought under examination seems to omit none that are met with in other histories of Latin literature. Though in a work of this kind it is difficult any longer to be original without at the same time appearing to be eccentric, nevertheless Prof. Rosa finds room to express views of his own, as may be seen in his discussion of the metres of Horace and of the Rhetoricians. But it is as a piece of Latin that we would most commend the work.

In **The Angel that Troubled the Waters** (Longmans: 6s. n.) we have Landor's "Imaginary Conversations" in a new and much more delicate guise. Mr. Thornton Wilder lets his fancy linger on some character or incident or possibility of the past and emblazons it in a short and vivid dialogue with aptly descriptive setting. The sixteen short episodes thus depicted deal with things sacred and profane, imaginary and real, but always with an artistic grace which cannot offend. Who else could

venture, for instance, to introduce humour into the *Flight into Egypt* and yet edify instead of shock?

## POETRY.

True Devotion and genuine drama are united in the charming little mystery-play called *Holy Night* (Sheed and Ward: 5s. n.), translated from the Spanish of Gregorio Martinez Sierra by Philip Hereford and illustrated by Gabriel Pippet. The truth that Christ came to seek and to save those that are lost is conveyed with grace and conviction, and, if adequately acted, the play would have a very salutary effect.

The striking verses which, signed Charles L. O'Donnell, have appeared from time to time in American magazines have been collected by their author, who is President of the University of Notre Dame, in a slender volume called *A Rime of the Road and other Poems* (Longmans: 7s. 6d. n.). It is not the poet's first collection and Father O'Donnell's muse seems destined to become as familiar to lovers of poetry as that of J. B. Tabb, whose felicity of diction is often recalled in the volume before us. The title poem is especially remarkable for its force and delicate artistry.

## FICTION.

It would be hard to imagine anyone more competent to write a stirring novel of penal times than Miss Agnes Blundell, the author of *Ancient Lights* (Sands: 6s. n.), for in addition to much literary skill and experience, she possesses in the family "Crosby Records" and other sources the actual materials out of which a story, truer and more terrible than fiction, calls to be written. It has been done well, on the whole, and the authoress gives us, what we so sadly need for our inspiration and encouragement, a many-coloured picture of the career of a recusant in the later days of "Good Queen Bess." It will serve to give fuller meaning to the Centenary Year of Emancipation.

We are not told whether the stories in the style of the Fioretti—*Told by Brother Giles* (Sands: 2s. 6d. n.)—by Francisca Hewlett, are taken from Franciscan sources or originate in the mind of the authoress. In either case they reproduce, in their grace and edifying quality, the spirit of the famous "Flowers."

An act of unselfish kindness rewarded by an unexpected legacy enables "Mary Rose," in *Mary Rose at Rose Gables* (Benziger Bros.: \$1.00), by Mrs. M. M. Wirries, to develop her powers of making other people happy and good. The story is charmingly told with plenty of humour and clever delineation of character.

Father R. E. Holland, S.J. in *Dan's Worst Enemy* (Benziger Bros.: \$1.25) depicts the effects of a subtle form of vanity in a boy's character which makes him overrate himself and resent correction. However, it does not go very deep, and it is finally exorcised by his failure in an important commission entrusted to him by his father—a commission which lands him in many adventures. The English reader will learn from this lively tale much to interest him in the descriptions of American life both at home and at school.

What Miss Vera C. Barclay does not know about Scouts and Wolf-Cubs, not to say Brownies and Guides, would go on a postage stamp and when she works up all this lore into a series of adventures, the result is very appetizing. So we prophesy a large market for *Danny's Pack*

(Pearson: 2s. 6d. n.), which has the additional attraction for Catholic boys of being, though not obtrusively, Catholic in tone and spirit.

Amid scenes made familiar to us by the *Life of Charles de Foucauld*, M. Albert Bessières has constructed a romance of poignant and edifying interest called *Le Desert Fleurira* (Editions Spes: 10.00 fr.).

#### NON-CATHOLIC.

There seems to be a growing fashion, begun perhaps by the influence of Rabindranath Tagore, for Christians to study themselves and their Lord through non-Christian interpreters. Sometimes the results are unfortunate and pitiful, as in the recent display of Dr. Ludwig; sometimes, on the human side, they are more successful, though they must always fall short of that which the Christian understands by the supernatural. In *Jesus, the Son of Man* (Heinemann: 8s. 6d. n.), by Kahlil Gibran, we have a portrait rather of the second kind, certainly something more sympathetic than Ludwig's book with the same name. The author chooses seventy-nine contemporaries of Our Lord, some Scripture characters, others of his own invention, some good, others evil, and allows each one to give his impression, in a kind of soliloquy, of the Central Figure. The book is reverent throughout; the language teems with oriental colour, expressed especially in striking simile; the illustrations, done by the author, are very original. On the other hand there seems to us a certain straining after effect, both in the illustrations and in the text, which makes the whole work appear somewhat artificial. This may be due to the western inability altogether to grasp the music of the East.

Faced with a book which aims at being "an attempt to conduct an independent enquiry into the leading problems which confront mankind," a book called *An Analysis of Life* (Simpkin Marshall: 5s. n.), by Harold Clunn, one's first thought is—what is the competence of the author to conduct such an enquiry and, in particular, of what philosophy or belief does it aim at being "independent." One does not need to read much of Mr. Clunn before discovering that he is not a Christian and that his philosophy is of the shallowest. On the very first page, he identifies God and the universe as forming together one perfect whole, and, on the second, he actually uses the argument from causation to prove that there is *no* first Cause! After that, the reasonable man may not care to read more of Mr. Clunn, but, if he perseveres, he will find him a shrewd observer of things that come under his own experience and a keen critic of many modern abuses.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. John Hunt Lynn, applying his mind to the study of the Bible, has arrived at certain conclusions regarding the teaching thereof which he has published with the title *Grace, Government and Glory: Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony Papers* (Thynne and Jarvis: 3s. 6d.). A good deal of close study of the Sacred Text is evident from his pages, as also a manifest zeal, but in the end we have to ask ourselves why we should follow the guidance of Mr. Lynn in this difficult matter, rather than the accredited leadership of the Church. No doubt he means us to test his teaching for ourselves: why should we even do that when we ourselves can search the Scriptures?

Messrs. D. B. Wyndham Lewis and G. C. Heseltine have gone far afield in space and time to collect the delightful Miscellany which they call *A Christmas Book* (Dent and Sons: 6s. n.) but which can be savoured and enjoyed at all seasons. Never has there been so catholic an anthology, wherein Martial jostles Belloc, and Rabelais the Venerable Bede, wherein pietistic neighbours good cheer, and ancient French consorts with modern slang. It is a compilation for all moods except the Calvinistic.

Fr. Ronald Knox, having been asked by divers persons where to find this or that of his excellent but scattered *jeux d'esprit*, has collected a number of them together in *Essays in Satire* (Sheed and Ward: 7s. 6d.) and so gratified those who want them all. These latter will be many, for there is not one included here which does not illustrate the humour and versatility of the author and his uncanny cleverness in word-play. The gems of the collection are undoubtedly the religious satires in the style of Swift and Dryden—"Reunion all Round" (a prophecy which events are rapidly realizing) and "Absolute and Abitoshell," (reflections on the Anglican work "Foundations"). But there is none which cannot be re-perused with pleasure, not excepting the famous "broadcast" from Edinburgh whereby he amused, frightened or irritated the inhabitants of these isles—each in accordance with the "gleeness of his up tak."

## MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

La Bonne Presse of Paris publishes this year, 1929, the fiftieth annual issue of its well-known *Almanach du Pelerin* for 2.00 fr. filled with short stories with illustrations, plain and coloured, and abundance of useful information.

Together with a number of reprints, the C.T.S. has issued the following new twopenny pamphlets:—*Did Christ Organize a Church?*, by A. H. C. Downes, a short and clear answer to modern Christian sects; *The Basis of Christian Unity*, by the Archbishop of Cincinnati, a commentary on the recent Papal Encyclical; and *Common-sense Talks on Morality*, by Rev. Joseph Degen, which are just what the title indicates.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

AMERICA PRESS, New York.

*Fiction by its Makers*. Edited by F. X. Talbot, S.J. Pp. 208. Price, 82. 00. *The Catholic Mind*. Vol. XXIV. Nos. 18—22.

BIBLICAL INSTITUTE, Rome.

*Institutiones Biblicae*. Vol. II. No. 1. *De Pentateucho*. By A. Bea, S.J. Pp. 188. Price, 151.

BURNS, OATES AND WASHBURN, London.

*A Chesterton Catholic Anthology*. Compiled by P. Braybrooke. Pp. xvi. 111. Price, 6s. n. *Indulgences*. By Cardinal Lepicier. Third revised edition. Pp. xxii.

498. Price, 10s. 6d. *Of the Joy of Loving God*. By Fr. Mortier, O.P. Translated by Dominican Sisters. Pp. viii. 96. Price, 2s. 6d. *Prayers of Fra Thomas of Jesus*. Preface by Archb. Goodier. Pp. 43. Price, 6d. *Little Lives of Great Tertiaries*. By Marian Nesbitt. Pp. 86. Price, 2s. 6d. *Sermons on Ste. Thérèse*. From the Italian of Fr. Francis Xavier, O.D.C. *Levitation*. By Olivier Leroy. Pp. xiii. 276. Price, 10s. 6d. *Notes of Retreats given by Fr. Bernard Vaughan*. Re-

corded by Caroline Lady Paget. Pp. viii. 211. Price, 6s. *Some Pathfinders of Organic Evolution*. By Philip de Ternant. Pp. vii. 88. Price, 1s. *St. Thérèse de l'Enfant Jesus*. From the French of Mgr. Laveille, by M. Fitzsimmons, O.M.I. Pp. xvi. 447. Price, 6s.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD, Oxford. *Retreats*. (Yearbook for 1928). Pp. 65. Price, 6d. n.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London. *Many Twopenny Pamphlets and Re-prints*.

DE GIGORD, Paris. *Le Problème International*. Various authors. Pp. 230. Price, 12.00 fr.

DENT AND SONS, London. *Letters from Baron F. Von Hügel to a Niece*. Edited by Gwenolen Greene. Pp. xlv. 201. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

GABALDA, Paris. *La Spiritualité Chrétienne*. Vol. IV. P. 2. By P. Pourrat. Pp. xii. 672. Price, 25.00 fr.

HERDER & CO., Freiburg. *Leben und Briefe der Schwester Emilie Schneider*. By Karl Richstatter, S.J. Pp. 277. Price, 5.20 m. *Johann Philip Roothan*. By Augustin Neu, S.J. Pp. viii. 255. Price, 7.00 m.

HERDER, London. *The Life of Christ*. By Rev. L. C. Fillion, S.S. Translated by Rev. N. Thompson, S.T.D. Vol. II. Pp. viii. 720. Price, 16s.

HERMANN RAUCH, Wiesbaden. *Apostol-Briefe*. By R. K. Lewin. Pp. 447. Price, 10 m.

KEGAN PAUL, London. *Aspects of Age, Life and Disease*. By Sir H. Rolleston. Pp. 304. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Epidemiology, Old and New*. By Sir William Hamer. Pp. x. 180. Price, 9s. n.

LONGMANS, London. *Catholicism and the Modern Mind*. By Michael Williams. Pp. 348. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Thomas Aquinas*. By Dr. M. Grabmann. Translated by Virgil Michel, O.S.B. Pp. vii. 191. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *A Rime of the Road and Other Poems*. By C. L. O'Donnell, C.S.C. Pp. viii. 78. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Religion Without God*. By F. J. Sheen, Ph.D. Pp. xiv. 368. Price, 15s. n.

MEILLEURS LIVRES, Paris. *L'Esprit public aux Etats-unis après la Guerre*. By A. Lugan. Pp. 222.

MESSAGER DU S.C., Montreal. *Miguel-Augustin Pro S.J.* By Antonio Dragon. Pp. 166.

METHUEN, London. *Erasmus the Reformer*. By L. Elliott Biens, D.D. and ed. Pp. xxii. 135. Price, 5s. n.

ORIENTAL STUDIES, Rome. *Doctrina theologiae Orientis Separatae de SS. Eucharistia*. Vol. I. By Theophilus Spacil, S.J. Pp. 96. Price, 9.00 l.

PEARSON LTD., London. *Danny's Pack*. By Vera C. Barclay. Pp. 127. Price, 2s. 6d.

SANDS & CO., London. *Teresa Higginson*. Abridged from the larger life. By Cecil Kerr. Pp. 64. Price, 1 shilling net. *An Eight Day's Retreat: Adapted from the French of Père Longhayé, S.J.* By Bertram Wolferstan, S.J. Pp. 307. Price, 8s. 6d. n. *The Life of the Ven. Joseph Passerat, C.S.S.R.* From the French of H. Girouille, C.S.S.R. By Rev. J. Carr. Pp. 587. Price, 12s. 6d. n. *The Three Kings*. By F. J. Bowen. Pp. 59. Price, 1s. n. *St. Willfrid*: 633-709. By Notre Dame Sisters. Pp. 240.

SHEED AND WARD, London. *The Church and War*. By Rev. F. Stratmann, O.P. Pp. 219. Price, 5s. n. *Christ and Renan*. By M. J. Lagrange, O.P. Translated by Maisie Ward. Pp. 127. Price, 3s. 6d. n.

S.P.C.K., London. *Devout Humanism*. By Henri Bremond. Translated by K. L. Montgomery. Pp. xxiii. 423. Price, 16s. n.

STRATFORD COMPANY, Boston. *A Catholic looks on Life*. By James J. Walsh. Pp. v. 274. Price, \$2.50.

THE AUTHOR. *Legends and Shrines of Knaresborough*. By Abbot Cummins, O.S.B. 2nd edit. Pp. 40. Price, 1s.

"THE VENERABLE," Rome. *Obit Book of the Venerable English College*. Compiled by Cardinal Gasquet. Pp. 109. Price, 2s. n.

THYNNE AND JARVIS, London. *Grace, Government and Glory*. By J. H. Lynn. Pp. 261. Price, 3s. 6d.

WAGNER, New York. *The Capuchins in French Louisiana*. By C. L. Vogel. Pp. xxvi. 201. Price, \$1.50.

